



\$~56

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 6111/2025**

**JAGMIT SINGH**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mandeep Singh Vinaik, Ms. Anjali Sharma, Mr. S. K. Sagar, Ms. Thanglunkim, Mr. Gaikhuanlung and Ms. Satviki Saran, Advs. along with petitioner in person

versus

**STATE GOVT OF NCT AND ANR**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State with Ms. Upasna Bakshi, Adv.

SI Praveen Kumar, PS Defence Colony

Mr. Anunaya Mehta, Mr. Vidhan Malik and Ms. Anandita Tayal, Advs. for R-2 along with R-2

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL**

**ORDER**

**10.11.2025**

%

**CRL.M.A. 33019/2025 (early hearing)**

1. Through the present application, the petitioner seeks early hearing of CRL.M.C. 6111/2025.
2. Owing to sufficient cause being shown in the application, the same is allowed and the next date of hearing of CRL.M.C. 6111/2025 is preponed and the matter is taken up today.
3. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

**CRL.M.C. 6111/2025**

4. The instant petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter "BNSS") [earlier Section 482 of the



Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter “CrPC”)] has been filed on behalf of the petitioner praying for the quashing of FIR no. 51/2013, registered at Police Station – Defence Colony, for offences punishable under Sections 498A/406/420/120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter “IPC”).

5. The brief facts concerning the present dispute are that the marriage between petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 was solemnized on 12.12.1997, according to Hindu rites and ceremonies. However, due to some temperamental differences between them, shortly after their marriage, they started living separately.

6. Despite efforts of reconciliation, both the parties could not settle their differences, pursuant to which respondent no. 2 got FIR no. 51/2013 registered.

7. However, at this stage, with the intervention of family members and relatives, both the parties have entered a settlement on 04.05.2023 and a Settlement Deed was executed between the parties. The terms and conditions of the said settlement are mentioned in the Memorandum of Settlement which is annexed as “Annexure D” to the petition. The Supplementary Settlement deed dated 21.09.2024 is also on record and the same has been annexed as “Annexure E”. The Second Supplementary Settlement Deed dated 30.05.2025 is also on record and the same has been annexed as “Annexure G”. In pursuance of the settlement, the parties have jointly agreed that they shall move for divorce under Section 13B (1) and under Section 13B (2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (hereinafter “HMA”) and accordingly, per the submission of parties, a divorce decree dated 30.10.2025 was passed by the Court concerned.



8. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that respondent no. 2 has settled all her claims in respect of her dowry articles, *stridhan*, marriage expenses, jewelleryes, gift items and claims of past, present and future maintenance and permanent alimony with the petitioner and all disputes of any nature whatsoever for a sum of ₹ 4,00,00,000/-.

9. It is, thus, prayed that the instant FIR be quashed on the basis of Settlement Deeds on record.

10. Learned APP for the State, who appears on advance notice, accepts notice and submits that there is no opposition to the prayer made on behalf of the petitioner seeking quashing of the FIR in question in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

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

12. The petitioner is present before this Court and has been identified by his counsel and the Investigating Officer, Police Station Defence Colony. Respondent no. 2 is also present in the Court and has been identified by her counsel and the concerned Investigating Officer.

13. The instant criminal proceedings concern non-compoundable offences that are private in nature and do not have a serious impact on society, especially considering that there is a settlement/compromise between the victim and the 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 petitioners or any person related to them.

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 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 do not have a serious impact on 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 is satisfied that the nature of the offence does not impact the conscience of 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 entirety of disputes with the petitioner amicably and of her own free will, without any pressure or coercion. There is also no allegation from respondent no. 2 that the conduct and antecedents of petitioner have been bad towards her after entering into this compromise. As per the Settlement Agreement, respondent no. 2 has received the entire settled amount. Further, she submits that she has no objection to the present FIR being quashed.

**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 No. 51/2013, registered at Police Station – Defence Colony, for offences punishable under Sections



498A/406/420/120-B of the IPC, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom stand quashed *qua* the present petitioner.

**19.** The Registry is directed to release the funds deposited with it by the petitioner in favour of respondent no. 2, along with interest, if any, that may have accrued on the same, within a period of 6 weeks from today.

**20.** Children from the wedlock, if any, are free to assert their rights in accordance with law upon their attaining the age of majority.

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

**22.** The date already fixed, i.e., 25.11.2025 stands cancelled.

**AJAY DIGPAUL, J**

**NOVEMBER 10, 2025/ar/av**