



\$~41

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 432/2025**

SATISH KUMAR & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ujjwal Kumar, Mr. Hrithik Rana,
Mr. Vipin Kumar, Advs. with the petitioners in
person

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Satish Kumar, APP for State with
Ms. Upasna Bakshi, Adv. along with Insp Sunil
Sidhy and SI Ekta, PS Mangolpuri
Mr. Basant Kumar Gautam, Mr. Pawan Deep
Gautam and Mr. Aniket Kumar, Advs. for R-2
with R-2 in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

ORDER

13.11.2025

%

1. 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 by the petitioners praying for quashing of FIR No. 675/2016 registered at Police Station Mangolpuri for the offences punishable under Sections 447/506/509/354/354A/376 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter "IPC") and Sections 3(i)(x)/3(2)(va)/3(1)(r)/3(1)(s)/3(w)(ii) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.



2. The brief facts of the case are that respondent no. 2, who had known petitioner no. 3 for several years, alleges that he professed love and induced her into a physical relationship on repeated promises of marriage despite knowing that their families belonged to different castes. She states that although petitioner no. 3 maintained this relationship for years, he ultimately married another girl on 24.11.2015 with his parents' consent, but continued to meet and threaten her, insisting that she was his 'wife' and that he would marry her after the death of his spouse. Respondent no. 2 further alleges that on 29.05.2016, when her parents confronted petitioner no. 3, he vandalised her car and abused her, and thereafter, along with petitioner nos. 1 and 2, threatened and abused her using casteist insults while claiming police influence and warning of dire consequences. Pursuant thereto, the FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the chargesheet has already been filed against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner and respondent no. 2 have amicably settled their disputes and are desirous of leading a peaceful and harmonious life.

4. Compromise deed dated 07.12.2024 is on record and has been annexed as "Annexure C". *Qua* this deed, the respondent no. 2 has agreed to withdraw the case arising out of FIR No. 675/2016 registered at Police Station Mangolpuri against the petitioners.

5. It is prayed by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties that the instant FIR may be quashed on the basis of the compromise.

6. Learned APP for the State, who appears on advance notice, accepts notice and submits that there is no opposition to the prayer made by the



petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR in question in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

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

8. The petitioners are present before this Court and have been identified by their counsel and Investigating Officer, Police Station Mangolpuri. Respondent no. 2 is also present in the Court and has been identified by her counsel and the Investigating Officer.

9. Upon a query put forth by this Court, respondent no. 2 has categorically stated that she has entered into the compromise of her own volition and without any coercion or undue influence. It has further been stated that the entire dispute stands amicably resolved between the parties. She affirmed that the settlement has been arrived at for securing her future and, as a matter of prudence, the parties have decided to put a quietus to the present proceedings. Respondent no. 2 additionally submits that the pendency of the FIR is causing hindrance in her efforts to move on with her life, including creating difficulties in prospective marriage proposals. She states that she has now started working in Bengaluru and wishes to resolve the matter so that she may continue with her life without any further impediment.

10. In view of the fact that the parties have amicably settled the matter, and further having regard to the circumstance that no useful purpose would be served by continuing with the present proceedings, which would rather cause hardship to respondent no. 2 in moving ahead with her life, this Court is conscious that ordinarily, it is not inclined to entertain petitions of this nature where the alleged offences are of a grave kind. However, since respondent no. 2 has voluntarily and of her own free will expressed her



desire to put the matter behind her and move on with her life, this Court is persuaded to take this view.

11. It is, thus, in the interest of justice to quash the afore-mentioned FIR and the proceedings emanating therefrom.

12. Hence, in light of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab (2012) 10 SCC 303*, FIR No. 675/2016 registered at Police Station Mangolpuri for the offences punishable under Sections 447/506/509/354/354A/376 of the IPC, and Sections 3(i)(x)/3(2)(va)/3(1)(r)/3(1)(s)/3(w)(ii) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, and consequent proceedings emanating therefrom, are quashed *qua* the present petitioners.

13. The petition alongwith pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J

NOVEMBER 13, 2025

Sk/yr