



\$~60

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

+ CRL.M.C. 6639/2025 and CRL.M.A. 27918/2025

DEEPAK KUMAR & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Narendra Sharma, Mr. Puneet Gupta, Mr. Neel Kr. Sharma and Mr. Aakash Keshari, Advocates with petitioners in person.

versus

THE STATE OF GOVT NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the State with SI Abhimanyu, PS – Sonia Vihar.
Mr. L.B. Rai and Mr. Ayush Pandita, Advocates for respondents no. 2 to 5 with respondents no. 2 to 5 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER
17.09.2025

%

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of an FIR No. 425/2021 dated 16.09.2021 for the alleged offences under Sections 323, 341, 427, 452, 506 and 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Sonia Vihar, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. Per FIR, complainant Narendra reported that his brother's in-laws, Netrapal (father-in-law), his sons Deepak and Nitin, and brother-in-law Mohit along with Rakesh and 3–4 others, forcibly entered his house armed



with sticks and iron rods and assaulted him and injured his wife, son and maternal uncle. Household items like the fridge, cooler, and windows were damaged, and threats were extended.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners and respondent amicably settled their disputes vide Settlement Agreement dated 25.03.2025 before Mediation centre, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi which is placed on record (**Annexure- C**). Learned counsel further submits that the affidavits to the effect of no objection to quashing deposed by respondent No.2-4 are also placed on record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that as per the settlement, both sides agreed to withdraw pending criminal and civil cases, including FIR No. 135/2022 under Section 498A/406 IPC and related matrimonial litigations such as maintenance, DV Act, divorce, and execution petitions. It was also agreed that the daughter of Petitioner No. 2 and her husband would file a joint petition under Section 13B of the Hindu Marriage Act for dissolution of marriage by mutual consent, with liberty to seek waiver of the statutory cooling-off period.

5. In response to a Court query, both the counsel for respondents No. 2 to 5 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.

6. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and respondents as well as perused the material available on record.

7. The complainant and the petitioner who stated to have caused injury are closely related being father-in-law and son-in-law. In fact, it appears that



dispute originally germinated from a matrimonial acrimony between the complainant and his wife. The petitioner being a doting father unconditionally sided up with his daughter and the same resulted into an heated altercation between the complainant and the petitioner. Same spiraled into unsavoury incident of getting physically violent.

8. In the cross fight, the complainant suffered minor injuries and leveled the allegations as enumerated in the FIR. Subsequently, with the intervention of the family friends and elders, it dawned upon the complainant that the prudence warrants that he should rather settle the matter amicably instead of taking recourse to civil and criminal proceedings in the larger interest of his own peace as well as that of the family.

9. Accordingly, the matter has been amicably settled. Steps have been taken to dissolve the marriage of the complainant and his wife as has been informed by the complainant that first motion has already been recorded and the second shall also be filed in due course.

10. Since both sides do not now wish to press charges against each other and in the absence of any incriminating material against them, coupled with the fact that the parties have amicably compromised the matter, the proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of law.

11. The dispute, being private and personal in nature arising out of their matrimonial relationship, has since been amicably resolved, and the complainant himself does not wish to pursue the case. In these circumstances, pursuing the criminal case would serve no useful purpose, would unnecessarily burden the judicial system, and may even rekindle hostility between the parties, thereby defeating the very object of the settlement, whereas quashing the same would, however, foster peace and



harmony between them.

12. Thus, in the larger interest of justice, and in exercise of the inherent powers vested in this Court, it is deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question arising out of matrimonial dispute between the private parties. Reference may also be made to the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***.

13. Consequently, the instant petition is allowed. The criminal proceedings arising out of FIR No. 425/2021 dated 16.09.2021 under Sections 323, 341, 427, 452, 506 and 34 of IPC registered at Police Station Sonia Vihar, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

14. Pending application, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 17, 2025

kd