



\$~49

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.M.C. 4162/2025**

UMMAT ALI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Paramjeet, Adv.
Petitioner in person.

versus

**THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR. &
ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State.
SI Bhramprakash, PS Sultan Puri
Mr. Ghanshyam and Mr. Narender Sharma, Adv.
for Respondent no.2
Respondent no.2 in person.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL**

**ORDER
17.12.2025**

%

1. The instant petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter "BNSS") [earlier Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter "CrPC")] has been filed on behalf of the petitioner praying for the quashing of FIR No. 655/2013, registered at Police Station Sultan Puri, for offences punishable under Sections 498A/506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter "IPC").
2. The brief facts concerning the present dispute are that the marriage between the petitioner and respondent no. 2 was solemnized on 17.06.2000, according to Muslim rites and ceremonies.
3. Temperamental differences arose between the parties thereafter.



Despite efforts at reconciliation, both the parties could not settle their differences, pursuant to which respondent no. 2 got FIR No. 655/2013 registered.

4. However, at this stage, with the intervention of family members and relatives, both the parties have entered a settlement on 01.11.2023. In pursuance of the said settlement, the parties have jointly agreed that they shall take *talaq* as per the Muslim Law. The *talaqnama* is also annexed as “Annexure P-2” to the petition.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that respondent no. 2 has settled all her claims in respect of her dowry articles, *mehar*, marriage expenses, jewellerys, gift items and claims of past, present and future maintenance and permanent alimony with the petitioner and all disputes of any nature whatsoever for a sum of ₹5,00,000/-, out of which a remaining amount of ₹1,50,000/- was agreed to be paid at the time of quashing of the FIR.

6. At this juncture, the petitioner has handed over a Demand Draft bearing No. 075318 dated 16.12.2025 for the balance amount of ₹1,50,000/- in the name of respondent no. 2 today in the Court. Respondent no. 2 has verified the particulars of the Demand Draft to her satisfaction and stated them to be correct.

7. It is, thus, prayed that the instant FIR be quashed on the basis of Settlement Deed dated 01.11.2023.

8. Learned APP for the State, who appears on advance notice, accepts notice and submits that there is no opposition to the prayer made on behalf of the petitioner seeking quashing of the FIR in question in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.



9. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
10. The petitioner is present before this Court and has been identified by his counsel and the Investigating Officer, Police Station Sultan Puri. Respondent no. 2 is also present in the Court and has been identified by her counsel and the concerned Investigating Officer.
11. The instant criminal proceedings concern non-compoundable offences that are private in nature and do not have a serious impact on society, especially considering that there is a settlement/compromise between the victim and the accused.
12. In such cases, it is settled law that High Court is also required to consider the conduct and antecedents of the accused in order to ascertain that the settlement has been entered into of her own free will and has not been imposed upon her by the petitioner or any person related to him.
13. In the case of *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan and Ors.* (2019) 5 SCC 688, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the powers conferred under Section 482 of the CrPC/Section 528 of the BNSS, can be exercised by the Courts to quash criminal proceedings featuring non-compoundable offences, when the matter arises out of matrimonial or family disputes. Moreover, it is pertinent to satisfy the Court that the said non-compoundable offences are private in nature and do not have a serious impact on society.
14. Furthermore, it was observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Ramgopal and Ors. v. The State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 INSC 568*, that the extraordinary power enjoined upon the High Courts under Section 482 of the CrPC/Section 528 of the BNSS can be invoked even when such a case falls within the ambit of non-compoundable offences,



given that the Court is satisfied that the nature of the offence does not impact the conscience of society, and that the compromise between the parties is voluntary and amicable.

15. In the present case, the complainant/respondent no. 2 is present in Court and has categorically stated that she has entered into compromise and settled the entirety of disputes with the petitioner amicably and of her own free will, without any pressure or coercion. There is also no allegation from respondent no.2 that the conduct and antecedents of petitioner have been bad towards her after entering into this compromise. As per the Compromise Deed, respondent no. 2 has received the entire settled amount. Further, she submits that she has no objection to the present FIR being quashed.

16. Therefore, in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties and the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the present petition is allowed. Accordingly, FIR No. 655/2013, registered at Police Station Sultan Puri, for offences punishable under Sections 498A/506 of the IPC, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom stand quashed *qua* the present petitioner.

17. Children from the wedlock, if any, are free to assert their rights in accordance with law.

18. The petition, along-with pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J

DECEMBER 17, 2025/AS/yr