



2025:DHC:11612



\$~46

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of decision: 19.12.2025

+ CRL.M.C. 9072/2025 & CRL.M.A. 37978/2025 STAY,
CRL.M.A. 37979/2025 EXEMPTION FROM FILING
CERTIFIED COPIES ETC.

CHETAN VATS @ CHETAN & ORS.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Adv. (appearance not
given) with petitioner no. 1 in
person and petitioner no. 2 to 5
through VC.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP
with SI Sachin Jamal, PS Sarai
Rohilla.
Mr. Mohit Kaushih, Adv. for R-
2 with brother of R-2 in person.
Respondent no. 2 through VC.

CORAM:-**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA****JUDGMENT(ORAL)****RAVINDER DUDEJA, J.**

1. This is a petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, seeking quashing of FIR No 0365/2018, dated 29.09.2018, registered at P.S Sarai Rohilla Delhi under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC and all proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of settlement between the parties.



2025:DHC:11612



2. The factual matrix giving rise to the instant case is that the marriage between Petitioner No.1 and Respondent no. 2/complainant was solemnized on 10.12.2013 as per Hindu Rites and ceremonies at Delhi. One child was born out of the said wedlock. However, on account of temperamental differences Petitioner No.1 and Respondent No. 2 are living separately since 23.01.2018.

3. As per averments made in the FIR, Respondent No. 2 was subjected to physical and mental harassment on account of dowry demands by the petitioners. FIR No 0365/2018 was lodged at the instance of respondent no. 2 at PS Sarai Rohilla under sections 498A/406/34 IPC against the petitioners. Chargesheet since been filed under Sections 498A/406/377/354A/34 IPC for allegations against petitioner no.1,2,3 & 4.

4. During the course of proceedings, the parties amicably resolved their disputes and the terms of settlement were written in the form of Compromise cum Settlement Deed dated 16.04.2024. It is submitted that petitioner no.1 and respondent no. 2 have obtained divorce on 21.04.2025 and the petitioner no.1 has paid the entire settlement amount of Rs. 50,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty Lacs Only) to respondent no. 2 for her and the minor daughter and the custody of the child shall remain with respondent no.2 without any visitation or custody rights for the petitioners as per the schedule in the settlement. Copy of the settlement dated 16.04.2024 has been annexed as Annexure P-4.



5. Petitioner no. 1 is physically present before the Court along with brother of respondent no. 2 while remaining petitioners and respondent no. 2 have entered their appearance through VC. They have been identified by their respective counsels as well as by the Investigating Officer SI Sachin Jamal from PS Sarai Rohilla.

6. Respondent No. 2 confirms that the matter has been amicably settled with the petitioners without any force, fear, coercion and she has received the entire settlement amount and has no objection if the FIR No 0365/2018 is quashed against the Petitioners.

7. In view of the settlement between the parties, learned Additional PP appearing for the State, also has no objection if the present FIR No 0365/2018 is quashed.

8. Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable settlement of disputes in *Rangappa Javoor vs The State Of Karnataka And Another, Diary No. 33313/2019, 2023 LiveLaw (SC) 74, Jitendra Raghuvanshi & Ors. vs Babita Raghuvanshi & Anr., (2013) 4 SCC 58 & in Gian Singh vs State of Punjab (2012) 10 SCC 303.*

9. Further, it is settled that the inherent powers under section 482 of the Code are required to be exercised to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process of any court. Further, the High Court can quash non-compoundable offences after considering the nature of the offence and the amicable settlement between the concerned



2025:DHC:11612



parties. Supreme Court and this Court have repeatedly held that the cases arising out of matrimonial differences should be put to a quietus if the parties have reached an amicable settlement. Reliance may be placed upon *B.S. Joshi v. State of Haryana, (2003) 4 SCC*.

10. In view of the above facts that the parties have amicably resolved their differences out of their own free will and without any coercion, it would be in the interest of justice, to quash the abovementioned FIR and the proceedings pursuant thereto.

11. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No 0365/2018, dated 29.09.2018, registered at P.S Sarai Rohilla Delhi under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC and all the other consequential proceeding emanating therefrom is hereby quashed.

12. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

13. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

December 19, 2025

MA/lks