



\$~73

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7161/2024**

SH.PARJIT JAIN AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sanchit Jain, Mr. Ankur Jain, Mr.
Diksh Yadav and Ms. Prachi Vats,
Advs.

Versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for State with SI
Akash Kumar, PS. Bhajanpura.
Mr. Arpit Jain and Ms. Sandhya,
Adv. for R-2 along with R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

22.01.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 CrPC seeking quashing of FIR No.494/2018 under Sections 498A/406/377/323/34 IPC registered at Police Station Bhajanpura and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the ground that the parties have arrived at a settlement.
2. Notice was issued in the present petition on 10.09.2024.
3. The learned APP submits that since the FIR is an outcome of a matrimonial dispute and the parties have arrived at a settlement, the State has no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed.



4. The petitioner no.1 (former husband) and the petitioner nos. 2 to 4, who are close relatives of the petitioner no.1, as well as, the respondent no. 2 (former wife) are present in Court and they have been identified by their respective counsel, as well as, by the Investigating Officer SI Akash Kumar, PS. Bhajanpura.

5. The brief facts of the case are that the marriage between the petitioner no.1 and respondent no. 2 was solemnized on 03.05.2013 according to Hindu Rites and Customs. Out of the said wedlock, two children were born namely Arihant Jain, who is aged about 06 years and presently in the care and custody of the petitioner no.1 whereas Avni Jain aged about 04 years and presently in the care and custody of the respondent no.2.

6. On account of temperamental issues certain disputes arose between the parties and they started living separately w.e.f. 11.06.2018. The dispute between the parties also led to the registration of present FIR.

7. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have arrived at a settlement, terms whereof were reduced in writing in the form of Memorandum of Understanding(MoU)/Settlement Deed dated 27.07.2020, which is annexed as Annexure C to the present petition.

8. In terms of the said settlement, the parties decided to dissolve their marriage by filing a petition for divorce by way of mutual consent. Accordingly, the petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 have obtained a decree of divorce dated 27.10.2022.

9. It is a term of the settlement between the parties that the petitioner no.1 shall pay a total sum of Rs.6.65 lacs to the respondent no.2 towards full and final settlement of all her claims on account of *streedhan*, permanent alimony, dowry articles, maintenance (past, present and future)



etc. in the manner as mentioned in the settlement. The entire amount of Rs. 6.65 lacs has been paid to the respondent no.2 by the petitioner no.1.

10. The receipt of entire amount of Rs.6.65 lacs is acknowledged by the respondent no.2, who is present in court.

11. The respondent no.2, on a query posed by the Court, states that she has no objection in case the FIR is quashed.

12. The offences alleged in the FIR are also under Section 377 IPC. A Co-ordinate Bench of this court in '*Rifakat Ali & Ors Vs. State & Anr.*' [CRL.M.C. No. 599/2021, decided on 26.02.2021] after referring to three decisions of the Supreme Court, has taken a view that an offence under Section 377 IPC, is though a heinous offence, but where such an offence is invoked in a matrimonial dispute and where the parties have decided to part ways and move ahead in their lives without acrimony against each other, power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. can be exercised even for an offence under Section 377 IPC on the ground that the dispute is private in nature. The material part of the said decision reads as under:-

"....10. A perusal of the three judgments which shows that the Supreme Court has consistently held that the power under Section 482 CrPC should not be used for quashing heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity etc. since these offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact in society. An offence under Section 377 IPC is a heinous offence and points to the mental depravity of the accused and hence ought not to be quashed by the High Court on the basis of compromise by exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC.

11. The present case arises out of matrimonial dispute and the allegation has been made by the wife against the husband. The parties have decided to part ways and get ahead in their lives



without having any acrimony against each other. In the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to exercise its powers under Section 482 CrPC even for an offence under Section 377 IPC on the ground that the dispute is private in nature.

12. The learned counsel for the petitioners has placed reliance on orders of this Court in CRL.M.C.830/2019 titled as Dinesh Kumar & Ors. v. State & Anr., CRL.M.C.1613/2019 titled as Anmol Katyal & Ors. v. State (NCT of Delhi) & Anr., CRL.M.C. 5216/2018 titled as Gajender Singh & Ors. v. State (NCT of Delhi) & Ors. and CRL.M.C. 4117/2018 titled as Joginder Singh Bote & Ors. v. NCT of Delhi & Anr. In all these cases wife has levelled allegation of the husband committing an offence under Section 377 IPC. This Court has exercised its jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC and has quashed the FIRs on the basis of the compromise entered into between the husband and wife.

13. It is made clear that this Court is exercising its powers under Section 482 CrPC to quash an offence of Section 377 IPC on the ground that the parties have compromised the matter with each other only because it arises out of a matrimonial dispute, the allegation has been levelled by wife against her husband of committing an offence under Section 377 IPC and the parties have decided to move ahead in life.”...

13. In view of the above legal position and regard being had to the fact that the parties have arrived at a settlement, no useful purpose will be served in continuing the proceedings, rather the same would create further acrimony between them.

14. It is, thus, in the interest of justice that the present FIR and all the other proceedings emanating therefrom be quashed.

15. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.494/2018 under



Sections 498A/406/377/323/34 IPC registered at Police Station Bhajanpura alongwith all other proceedings emanating therefrom, is quashed.

16. The petition stands disposed of in the above terms.
17. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 22, 2025/dss