



\$~60

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

+ CRL.M.C. 8843/2023 & CRL.M.A. 32997/2023

MR ASHISH GUPTA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sandeep Tyagi and Mr. Ashish Goyal, Advocates alongwith P-1 in person.

P-2 to P-8 through VC.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP for the State.

Insp. B.D. Meena, PS Badarpur.

R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

24.04.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition filed under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of the FIR no. 0428/2018 under Sections 498A/406 of the IPC and the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom including the chargesheet filed under Sections 498A/406/376/377/506/34 of the IPC and Section 3 of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, registered at P.S. Badarpur, New Delhi and pending before the court of Ms. Sheetal Chaudhary Pradhan, learned ASJ-02, South-East District, Saket Courts, Delhi.
3. The marriage between petitioner no.1/husband and respondent no.2/wife was solemnized on 05.02.2017 as per Hindu rites, customs and ceremonies.



4. No child was born out of the said wedlock.
5. Due to matrimonial differences between petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2, the parties started residing separately from 28.01.2018. Subsequently, respondent no.2/complainant lodged an FIR against the petitioners.
6. On 05.04.2022, the parties arrived at a settlement and as per the said settlement, petitioner no.1 has agreed to pay an amount of Rs. 17,00,000/- (Rupees seventeen lakhs only) to respondent no.2/wife towards full and final settlement of all her claims including *istridhan*, permanent alimony and maintenance - present, past and future.
7. In terms of the said settlement, the marriage between the parties stands dissolved by a decree of divorce dated 12.09.2022, passed by Ms. Madhu Jain, Principal Judge (South-East), Family Courts, Saket, Delhi (Annexure P-4). Further, as per the settlement deed, an amount of Rs. 12,00,000/- has already been paid to respondent no.2 and the remaining amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- has been paid to her in court today, by means of a demand draft.
8. Petitioner no. 1 and the complainant/respondent no. 2 are present before the Court. Petitioners nos. 2 to 8 are present through video conferencing, who have been duly identified by respondent no. 2 as well as counsel for petitioners.
9. A demand draft bearing no. 509043 dated 23.04.2025 for Rs. 5,00,000/- (Rupees five lakhs only) drawn on ICICI Bank, Faridabad, Haryana has been handed over to the complainant/Respondent No.2 in Court today, who acknowledges the receipt of the same.
10. The complainant/respondent No.2 states that the matter has been settled with the petitioners and she has no objection if the FIR and the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom including the chargesheet are quashed. She



further states that all the terms of the agreement have been complied with.

11. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, on instructions from the latter, submits that they shall not interfere in the life of respondent no. 2 in future.

12. In view of the settlement between the parties, learned APP for the State also has no objection if the present FIR and the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom including the chargesheet are quashed.

13. In **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes by observing as under:

“61. ... In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

14. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and the fact that the parties have put a quietus to the dispute, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR no. 0428/2018 under Sections 498A/406 of the IPC and the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom including the chargesheet filed under Sections 498A/406/376/377/506/34 of the IPC and Section 3 of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, registered at P.S. Badarpur, New Delhi and pending before the court of Ms. Sheetal Chaudhary Pradhan, learned ASJ-02, South-East District, Saket Courts, Delhi.

15. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR no.



0428/2018 under Sections 498A/406 of the IPC and the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom including the chargesheet filed under Sections 498A/406/376/377/506/34 of the IPC and Section 3 of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, registered at P.S. Badarpur, New Delhi and pending before the court of Ms. Sheetal Chaudhary Pradhan, learned ASJ-02, South-East District, Saket Courts, Delhi are hereby quashed.

16. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

17. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

APRIL 24, 2025/sn/Pc

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)