



\$~61

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 8026/2025 & CRL.M.A. 33542/2025**

MOHD AHAD KAMAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mohd. Yasin, Mr.
Dawneesh Shakti Vats,
Mr. Aman & Mr. Sami
Ahmed, Advs.

versus

GNCT DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ritesh Kumar Bahri,
APP for the State.
SI Munfaij, PS Jamia
Nagar.
Mr. D.K. Rai, Ms. Rachna
Rai, Mr. Mohan Goyal,
Mr. Rohan Teotia & Mr.
Prashant Sharma, Advs.
for R-2 along with R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

13.11.2025

%

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 280/2025 dated 03.07.2025 for offences under Sections 3/4 of the Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Marriage) Act, 2019 ('the Act') registered at Police Station Jamia Nagar, on the ground that the parties have settled their disputes.

2. It is averred that the marriage between Respondent No. 2 and petitioner was solemnized on 05.10.2023, as per Muslim rites, rituals and ceremonies. Thereafter, some misunderstandings took place between the parties.

CRL.M.C. 8026/2025

Page 1 of 3



3. Subsequently, Respondent No.2 made a complaint against petitioner and his family members, alleging that she was subjected to cruelty by them. Later, petitioner by pronouncing Talaq thrice instantaneously committed offence under Section 3 of the act, which later culminated into the present FIR.

4. The present petition is filed on the ground that the parties have settled their disputes by way of Memorandum of Understanding dated 19.08.2025, out of their own free will without any pressure, coercion, fraud or undue influence. Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 have obtained a decree of divorce and intend to live their future lives peacefully.

5. The parties are present in person in Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

6. The petitioner and Respondent No. 2 are present in person in Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

7. On being asked, Respondent No. 2 reaffirms that she has settled the disputes and she has no objection if the proceedings emanating from the subject FIR are quashed.

8. Offences under Sections 3/4 of the Act are compoundable.

9. This Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by relegating the parties to the learned Trial Court for filing an application to compound the offences.

10. Keeping in view the nature of dispute and that the parties have amicably entered into a settlement, this Court feels that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the dispute alive and continuance of the proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of Court.



11. In view of the above, FIR No. 280/2025 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

12. The present petition is allowed in aforesaid terms. Pending application(s) also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 13, 2025

“SK”