



\$~59

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

+ CRL.M.C. 6628/2025 and CRL.M.A. 27871/2025

NASREEN BANO AND OTHERSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Faiz Imam, Advocate with
petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF N.C.T. OF DELHI AND ANOTHERRespondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the
State with SI Manoj Kumar, PS –
Seelampur.

Complainant/Respondent no. 2 in
person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

17.09.2025

%

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of an FIR No. 033/2022 dated 04.01.2022 registered at Police Station Seelampur for the offences punishable under Section 307, 341 and 34 of IPC, and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.

2. The complainant alleged that petitioners assaulted her and tried to pour kerosene on her with intent to kill her. Petitioner no. 1 is mother-in-law, petitioner no. 2 is sister-in-law, petitioner no. 3 is brother-in-law and petitioner no. 4 is father-in-law Respondent no. 2/ complainant. After the settlement they are all living peacefully as a happy family.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was only a minor scuffle amongst family members with no such intent which the



complainant apprehended. The parties being family members have now amicably settled the dispute with the intervention of common friends, elders, and respectable members of society. He further submits that an affidavit of no objection to the quashing, deposed by respondent no. 2, has also been placed on record. He further submits that continuing prosecution would serve no purpose and amount to an abuse of process of law.

3.1 He also submits that no societal or public interest is involved, since the alleged act was without intention or motive and does not threaten political, financial, or social order. They are purely personal and matrimonial in nature.

3.2 Furthermore, he submits that the continuation of criminal proceedings would be oppressive, futile, and contrary to the interests of justice, making it a fit case for quashing of the FIR.

4. Both the counsel for Respondent No. 2 and the learned APP for the State concur with the factum of the compromise between the parties and convey their no objection to the quashing of the FIR.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, having heard the parties and perused the material on record.

6. Parties are present in the court.

7. I have interacted with the complainant. She seems very firm not to press any charges against her mother-in-law and others regardless of the allegations leveled in the FIR. She submits that the allegations in FIR arose out of the heated exchange of temper between two of them which spiraled into an altercation and leading to cross scuffle between the two due to minor family feud.

7.1 She further states that, in the process, both of them (mother-in-law &



daughter-in-law) were trying to get even with each other and in the cross scuffle, the accident took place which was unintended. She states that she and her husband are living together and leading a harmonious matrimonial life. She further submits that though she suffered minor injuries but in the larger interest of the family, she does not want to press any charges against her mother-in-law and/or others in the family.

8. On the other hand, her mother-in-law is also present in Court and she also offers her unconditional apology to the complainant, i.e. her daughter-in-law and states that she will maintain the cordiality in the family and shall not indulge in any domestic violence either verbal or physical in future. She has been let off with the warning even though it is not clear as to what led to the injuries to the complainant as she herself states that it was a result of a cross scuffle between the two persons.

9. *Qua* invoking Section 307 of the IPC and considering the alleged grievous injury suffered by the victim, on a Court query, both the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned counsel for the complainant submitted that, although allegations of grievous injury were made by the victim at the time of registration of the FIR, but the same were in heat of the moment. Subsequently, after receiving treatment, it turned out that the injury was simple in nature, and the complainant does not wish to press any charges against the accused.

10. Even on a plain reading, and in light of the candid statements of parties, it appears doubtful whether the essential ingredients of the offences invoked under the penal provisions are satisfied.

11. Be that as it may, given that the dispute has been resolved, continuing with criminal proceedings may serve no useful purpose. It would be a drain



on judicial resources and abuse of the process of law, especially when dispute does not involve any public interest or interest of the society at large. Continuation of the proceedings, on the other hand, may result in hostility between the parties and defeat the very purpose of the settlement.

12. In view thereof, considering that the parties are residing together harmoniously and leading a happy, peaceful, and tranquil family life, it would be travesty of justice to put the parties to undergo the harassment and humiliation of the trial, which in any case in all likelihood would result in the acquittal of the petitioners since respondent no.2, being family, does not wish to press any charges. Quashing the proceedings would, on the contrary, safeguard the sanctity of their family life, prevent unwarranted hardship, and uphold their right to live together in peace and dignity, free from stigma.

13. In the premise, applying the ratio in decision of ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab (2012) 10 SCC 303***, I deem it just and proper to invoke inherent powers of this Court under Section 528 of BNSS to avoid undue hardship to the parties for mutual good relations and societal peace.

14. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No. 033/2022 dated 04.01.2022 lodged at Police Station Seelampur, and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom for offence under Section 307, 341 and 34 of IPC, against the petitioners are hereby quashed.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 17, 2025/kd