



\$~12 & 38

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

12

+ **CRL.M.C. 8087/2025 & CRL.M.A. 33778/2025,**
CRL.M.A. 33779/2025

SMT. RAJBALA & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Pankaj Kumar and
Mr. Gautam Prabhakar,
Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI
& ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, APP for
the State with ASI
Omparkash, PS CWC /
Nanak Pura.

38

+ **CRL.M.C. 6080/2025 & CRL.M.A. 25863/2025,**
CRL.M.A. 25864/2025

SMT. PRAVESHPetitioner

Through: Mr. Mrigank Prabhakar,
Adv. (through VC)

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI
& ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, APP for
the State with ASI
Omparkash, PS CWC /
Nanak Pura.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **19.11.2025**

1. The present petitions are filed by the petitioners seeking quashing of FIR No. 30/2025 dated 19.05.2025, registered at Police Station Crime (Women) Cell Nanak Pura for the offences under Sections 498A/406/354(A)/354(B)/34 of the Indian Penal

CRL.M.C. 8087/2025 & CRL.M.C. 6080/2025

Page 1 of 4



Code, 1860 ('**IPC**').

2. The petitioners in CRL.M.C. 8087/2025 are the mother-in-law and brother-in-law of Respondent No. 2. The petitioner in CRL.M.C. 6080/2025 is the sister of the mother-in-law (*mausi*) of Respondent No. 2.

3. The present FIR was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No. 2 alleging that she was being subjected to cruelty in relation to demands of dowry as well as sexual harassment at the hands of the petitioners.

4. It is averred that the marriage between Respondent No. 2 and her husband namely Mr. Hemant Kumar was solemnized on 10.02.2023 as per Hindu Rites and Rituals. It is alleged that Petitioner No. 1 in CRL.M.C. 8087/2025 had initiated demands for dowry even before the marriage had been solemnized.

5. It is alleged that the Petitioner No. 1 in CRL.M.C. 8087/2025 and petitioner in CRL.M.C. 6080/2025 used to regularly taunt Respondent No. 2 for not bringing sufficient dowry at the time of marriage.

6. It is alleged that on the intervening night of 26-27.07.2023 at around 1:30 a.m., Petitioner No. 2 in CRL.M.C. 8087/2025 came to the room of Respondent No. 2 and said that he likes her and started touching her in an inappropriate manner, whereafter, Respondent No. 2 resisted and asked him to go back to his room.

7. It is alleged that thereafter Petitioner No. 2 in CRL.M.C. 8087/2025 locked the door of the room and started misbehaving with Respondent No. 2. It is alleged that he slapped Respondent No. 2 and allegedly put his hand inside the clothes of Respondent No. 2.



8. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that allegations made by Respondent No. 2 are vague, ambiguous and self-contradictory in nature. He submits that Respondent No. 2 has not given any specific detail regarding the allegations of dowry demand.

9. He submits that the FIR registered by Respondent No. 2 is an afterthought as Respondent No. 2 herself does not wish to live with her husband.

10. He submits that Respondent No. 2 has belatedly given the present complaint as the alleged incident is stated to have taken place 17 months prior to the registration of the present FIR.

11. *Per contra*, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State vehemently opposes the arguments as raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

12. He consequently prays that the present petitions be dismissed.

13. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

14. At the outset, it is relevant to note that while significant injustice may be caused to accused persons if they are subjected to suffer through an unwarranted trial, in the present case, the FIR was registered only a few months back and the chargesheet has already been filed. Petitioner No. 2 in CRL.M.C. 8087/2025 who is the brother-in-law has been chargesheeted for the offences under Sections 498A/354(A)/354(B)/34 of the IPC, Petitioner No. 1 in CRL.M.C. 8087/2025 who is the mother-in-law for the offences under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC and petitioner in CRL.M.C. 6080/2025 who is the sister of the



mother-in-law for the offences under Sections 498A/34 of the IPC.

15. Undisputably, the petitioners have the remedy of addressing arguments and raising all issues before the learned Trial Court while arguing on charge. It is not the case of the petitioners that the arguments are of such nature which cannot be appreciated by the learned Trial Court.

16. While this Court is empowered to quash criminal proceedings even after filing of chargesheet to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of law, it is well settled that ordinarily, this Court should be cautious to exercise inherent jurisdiction and interfere with the proceedings after chargesheet has been filed after thorough investigation [Ref. *State of Odisha v. Pratima Mohanty and Others*: (2022) 16 SCC 703].

17. This Court, in such circumstances, does not consider it apposite to entertain the present petition at this stage.

18. In view of the aforesaid discussion, the present petitions are accordingly dismissed with liberty to the petitioners to raise all arguments and issues before the learned Trial Court while addressing arguments on charge. Pending application(s) also stand disposed of.

19. Needless to say, the petitioners are also at liberty to approach this Court in case any grievance remains in future.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 19, 2025

'KDK'