



\$~57

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2248/2025 & CRL.M.A. 20918/2025**

MANISH MANCHANDA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Bhairav Dass, Mr. Yogesh Dass,
Ms. Anjali Badarwal, Ms. Latika Vashisht and Md
Shahbaz Ahmed, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for
the State with SI Pooja, PS Seema Puri.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

ORDER

22.07.2025

%

1. The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution read with Section 528 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter "BNSS") [earlier Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter "Cr.P.C.")] has been filed on behalf of the petitioners praying for quashing of FIR No. 277/2022, dated 17.03.2022, registered at Police Station - Seema Puri, for the offences punishable under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter "IPC" and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 (hereinafter "DP Act").
2. The brief facts of the case are that the marriage between petitioner no. 1 and respondent no.2 got solemnized on 30.10.2020, according to Hindu rites and ceremonies. However, due to some temperamental differences



between them, shortly after their marriage, they started living separately. Petitioners no. 2 to 4 are close relatives of the petitioner no. 1.

3. Despite several efforts of reconciliation, both the parties could not settle their differences pursuant to which respondent no. 2 filed a criminal complaint against the petitioners which was converted into FIR no. 277/2022.

4. However, at this stage, with the intervention of family members and relatives, both the parties have entered into a settlement on 08.04.2024 vide mediation order of the same date, before the Delhi mediation Centre, Karkardooma Court, New Delhi. The terms and conditions of the said settlement are mentioned in the settlement deed which is annexed as Annexure P-2 to the petition. In pursuance of the said settlement, the parties have jointly agreed that they shall move for divorce under Section 13B(1) and Section 13B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (hereinafter “HMA”) and accordingly on or before 28.02.2025.

5. Further, in terms of the said settlement, it has been agreed among the parties that the petitioner no. 1 shall pay a sum of Rs. 9,00,000/- to the respondent no. 2 as full and final settlement against all her and the child’s claims including maintenance (past, present and future), permanent alimony, *stridhan*, including the execution amount.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submitted that respondent no. 2 has settled all her claims in respect of her dowry articles, *stridhan*, marriage expenses, jewelries, gift items and claims of past, present and future maintenance and permanent alimony with the petitioners for a sum of Rs. 9,00,000/-(Rupees Fifteen Lakhs only), and all disputes of any nature whatsoever, out of which Rs 3,00,000/- was to be paid at the time of



filing the first motion, Rs 3,00,000/- at the time of filing the second motion, and the final amount of Rs.3,00,000/- was agreed to be paid at the time of quashing of the FIR. It was further agreed that, within one week after the disposal of the first motion petition, the complainant shall compound the offences under Sections 323/371 IPC in FIR no. 694/2021.

7. At this juncture, petitioner no. 1 has handed over two Demand Drafts bearing Nos. 392163 and 213341 for the balance amount of Rs.2,00,000/- and Rs. 1,00,000/- respectively, both dated 08.07.2025, in the name of respondent no.2 today before this Court. The respondent no.2 has verified the particulars of the Demand Draft to her satisfaction and stated them to be correct. The copy of the said Demand Draft is handed over by the learned counsel appearing on behalf petitioners during the course of the arguments, which is taken on record.

8. It is, thus, prayed that the instant FIR be quashed on the basis of terms of settlement recorded in mediation order dated 06.02.2025.

9. Learned Standing Counsel for the State submitted that there is no opposition to the prayer made on behalf of the petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR in question in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

10. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

11. The petitioners are present before this Court and have been identified by their counsel and the IO, Police Station Seema Puri. Respondent no.2 is also present in the Court and has been identified by her counsel and the IO.

12. On a query made by this Court, respondent no.2 has categorically stated that she has entered into compromise on her own free will and without any pressure. It is also stated by respondent no.2 that the entire dispute has



been amicably settled between the parties. Parties also undertook that they shall abide by all the terms and conditions of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

13. The instant criminal proceedings in respect of non-compoundable offences are private in nature and do not have a serious impact on the society especially when there is a settlement/compromise between victim and accused.

14. 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 by her own free will and has not been imposed upon her by the petitioner or any person related to him.

15. In the case of ***State of Madhya Pradesh vs. 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 the 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 does not have a serious impact on the society.

16. Furthermore, it was observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Ramgopal and Ors. Vs. 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 must be satisfied that the nature of the offence does not



impact the conscious of the society and that the compromise between the parties is voluntary and amicable.

17. 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 entire disputes amicably with the petitioners by her own free will without any pressure or coercion. There is also no allegation from respondent no.2 that the conduct and antecedents of petitioners have been bad towards her after the compromise. As per the settlement, the respondent no. 2 has received the entire settled amount. Further, her affidavit, stating no objection to the instant FIR being quashed, is also on record.

18. 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 bearing No. 277/2022, dated 17.03.2022, registered at Police Station - Seemapuri, for the offences punishable under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC and Section 4 of the DP Act and all the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

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

AJAY DIGPAUL, J

JULY 22, 2025
sk