



\$~34

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 6106/2025 & CRL.M.A. 25959/2025**

KULJEET SINGH AND ORSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Tushar Kwatra, Adv.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam,
APP for the State with SI
Shantanu, PS Sunlight
Colony.
Mr. Ruchir Batra and
Mr. Hitesh Batra, Adv.
for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **01.09.2025**

1. By the present petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of complaint filed by Respondent Nos. 2/ complainant under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 ('DV Act') against the petitioners.
2. It is pointed out that the complaint was filed way back in the month of March, 2024, and at this stage, the matter is pending for considering Respondent No. 2's application for interim maintenance.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the complaint was given by Respondent No. 2 on being influenced by her family members.
4. He submits that no domestic violence had ever been

CRL.M.C. 6106/2025

Page 1 of 3



inflicted on Respondent No. 2.

5. He further submits that even after filing of the complaint, Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 have been meeting.

6. I have perused the contents of the complaint.

7. Specific allegations have been made by the complainant in regard to the manner in which the domestic violence was inflicted. Specific dates have also been mentioned. It is also stated that in the month of January, 2024, the complainant came to know that Petitioner No. 1 was in relation with some woman. And on being confronted, was beaten by Petitioner No. 1 and on 17.01.2024, she was thrown out of her matrimonial house and her 2 ½ year old son (Respondent No. 3) was also snatched from her, which also led to filing of a writ of Habeas Corpus.

8. The complainant herself stated that even though many meetings took place between her and Petitioner No. 1, however, the parties could not resolve their disputes. She further mentioned that despite earning good amount of money, Petitioner No. 1 has been refusing to maintain her and she is now totally dependent on her mother.

9. The allegations, *prima facie*, indicate towards domestic violence. Domestic Violence Report has also been filed in that regard before the Trial Court.

10. In regard to the contention that the complaint has been given by Respondent No. 2 on being influenced by her family members, the same cannot be a ground for quashing the complaint. Also, both the parties have been meeting pursuant to filing of the complaint, cannot be taken as a conclusive fact that no domestic violence has been inflicted.



11. The complainant trying to resolve the disputes after filing of complaint, cannot be taken as a conduct that would dilute the allegations made against the petitioners.

12. It is not disputed by the parties that the parties tried to mediate even with the intervention of the Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, Delhi but the mediation had failed.

13. On being pointedly asked, learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 2 & 3, on instructions, states that there is no possibility of mediation and according to the complainant, the petitioner is only trying to shirk away from his liability by repeatedly requesting for mediation when he has no intention to settle the dispute.

14. Considering the above, I find no merit in the present petition.

15. The present petition is, therefore, dismissed. Pending application(s) also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 1, 2025

'KDK'