



\$~46

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 69/2026**

DEEPAK BEDI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Upender Kumar and Mr.
Abhinav Madan, Advocates
alongwith petitioner

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the
State alongwith SI Indrajeet, P.S.-
Rajouri Garden
Mr. Shubham, Advocate for R-2
alongwith R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **06.01.2026**

1. Issue notice. Ms. Priyanka Dalal, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, and Mr. Shubham, learned counsel for the respondent No.2, accept notice.
2. The petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.
3. By way of this petition, under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ["BNSS"] (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ["CrPC"]), the petitioner seeks quashing of proceedings arising out of FIR No. 703/2015 dated 26.05.2015, registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden, for offences punishable under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860



[“IPC”], and all proceedings emanating therefrom.

4. The petitioner and respondent No. 2 were married on 11.02.2007. Due to matrimonial discord and temperamental differences between the parties, they have been living separately since 10.02.2008. One male child has been born from the wedlock.

5. The present FIR was registered on 26.05.2015 at the instance of respondent No. 2. In the said FIR, the parents of the petitioner were named as accused Nos. 2 and 3, and his sisters and brother-in-law were named as accused Nos. 4 to 7. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parents of the petitioner passed away on 08.02.2019 and 09.03.2024, respectively. Copies of their death certificates have been annexed to the present petition as Annexures G and H, respectively. As far as accused No. 4 to 7 are concerned, they were discharged by an order of the Trial Court dated 12.05.2022. The petitioner is therefore the only surviving accused.

6. In the present petition, it is stated that the petitioner and the respondent No.2 have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding [“MoU”] dated 04.04.2025, by which the disputes have been settled. The MoU contemplates dissolution of the marriage by mutual consent. By a decree dated 06.08.2025 in HMA No. 1823/2025, the Principal Judge, Family Court, West District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, has granted the decree of dissolution of marriage.

7. By way of the settlement, the parties also agreed that a sum of Rs.9,00,000/- would be paid by the petitioner to the respondent No.2. Out of this amount, a sum of Rs.6,50,000/- has already been paid to the respondent No.2. The balance amount of Rs. 2,50,000/- was agreed to be



paid at the time of quashing of the present FIR.

8. Today, the parties are present before the Court and have been identified by their respective counsel, and respondent No. 2 is also identified by the Investigating Officer.

9. A Demand Draft for the balance amount of Rs. 2,50,000/- (DD No. 087069 dated 13.11.2025 drawn on Bank of Baroda, Sector - 15, Rohini, Delhi) is handed over to the respondent No.2 in the Court. A copy, thereof, is taken on record.

10. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily and without any coercion or undue pressure. Thus, they seek quashing of the criminal proceedings.

11. The power of the Court to quash criminal proceedings on the ground of a settlement has been considered by the Supreme Court in a number of cases. While emphasising that the exercise of the power under Section 482 of the CrPC in a particular case would depend upon the facts and circumstances of the case and no hard and fast categorisation is possible, the Supreme Court in *Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*, (2012) 10 SCC 303 [paragraph 58] observed that in case of offences arising out of matrimonial and family disputes, the wrong is basically to the victim and the quashing of criminal proceedings in such a case may be appropriate even if the offences have not been made compoundable. Similarly, the guidelines laid down in *Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*, (2014) 6 SCC 466 [paragraph 29.4] contemplate that FIRs arising out of such relationships can be quashed if it would meet the ends of justice or prevent the abuse of the process of the Court.

12. In view of the fact that the criminal proceedings in the present case



arise out of disputes which are essentially of private nature, there is no impediment to quashing of the criminal proceedings in such circumstances. Continuation of the criminal proceedings arising out of matrimonial discord, would serve no useful purpose and would only act as an impediment to the parties living in peace.

13. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. F.I.R. No. 0703/2015, dated 26.05.2015, registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden, for offences punishable under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

14. The parties will remain bound by the terms of the settlement.

15. The date of birth of the child born from the wedlock is 08.01.2008 and therefore, he is still a minor. He remains in the custody of his mother. It is made clear that this order does not affect any rights of the minor child.

16. The petition accordingly stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 6, 2026

Dy/JM/