



\$~61

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 5430/2025**

RAJEEV AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr.Vikas Yadav and Ms. Upma
Yadav, Advocates for P-1

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr.Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State alongwith W/SI Priyanka, P.S-
Janakpuri
Ms.Anuradha Sharma, Advocate for
R-2 (VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

%

11.08.2025

CRL.M.A. 23313/2025 (Exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 5430/2025

1. Compromise quashing of an FIR No. 834/2014 dated 23.07.2014 registered at Police Station Janakpuri, for the offences punishable under Sections 498A/406/323/34 IPC is sought herein.
2. The petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 got married on 28.01.2007 according to Hindu rites. One child is also born out of the wedlock. However, due to differences and disputes between the petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2, they started residing separately from each other leading to



lodging of the present FIR on the complaint of the respondent No.2. During the pendency of the said petition, the parties have settled the matter amicably vide settlement agreement dated 22.10.2024.

3. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard the rival contentions and also interacted with the parties who are present in Court through video conferencing (duly identified by their respective counsel).

4. On a Court query put to the complainant, she candidly submits that she has arrived at mutual settlement on her own volition without any duress or coercion. She further states that pursuant to the settlement, the petitioner No.1-husband has complied with the terms of the settlement to her satisfaction and nothing remains payable to her. The complainant states that in view of the settlement, she does not wish to press any charges against the petitioners.

5. It transpires that during the pendency of the proceeding before this Court, pursuant to the said settlement, the parties have also taken a divorce decree dated 29.05.2025 by mutual consent from the competent Court.

6. Having interacted with the complainant and given that seems to be an entirely family matter not involving either in public interest or any societal interest, it would be an exercise in futility to continue with the further criminal proceedings as the same would be nothing but abuse of the process of law apart from the heavy burden on the judicial system as well as wasteful expenditure of the public by the prosecution.

7. Dispute between the parties are purely private in nature, which arose due to matrimonial discord.

8. The genuineness of compromise is not in dispute. However, since the trial Court was not empowered to compound certain offences, the criminal



proceedings could not be dropped. In the premise, in the larger interest of justice, invoking inherent powers vested with this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. (Now Section 528 of BNSS, 2023) it is deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question. Reference in this context may be had to judgment rendered in the case of ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***.

9. Taking a wholesome view and in order to let the parties to enter mutual cordiality and the family bonhomie which will go long way to establish peace rather than promote hostility in case further proceedings continue, this is a fit case to exercise inherent power under 528 of BNSS in quashing the FIR in question.

10. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No. 834/2014 dated 23.07.2014 registered at Police Station Janakpuri, for the offences punishable under Sections 498A/406/323/34 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed.

11. The petition stands disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

AUGUST 11, 2025/dy