



\$~46

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 382/2026**

DIVYANSH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Vijendra Singh Dhangar and Ms.
Nirupama Singh, Advocates

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State with Mr. Hemant Kumar, Sub
Inspector, P.S. Jafrabad
Mr. Anuj Kumar and Mr Himanshu
Chugh, Advocates for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

16.01.2026

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioners seek quashing of FIR bearing no. 243/2024, registered at Police Station Jafrabad, North-East Delhi, for commission of offence punishable under Sections 323/354/354(A)/506/509/498A/406/34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter 'IPC') and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 (hereafter '*D.P. Act*').
2. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.
3. All the petitioners and respondent no. 2 are present before this Court and have been identified by their counsel and Investigating Officer (IO)



from Police Station Jafrabad, North-East, Delhi.

4. Brief facts of the present case are that the marriage between petitioner no.1 and respondent no. 2 was solemnized on 15.03.2021 according to Hindu rites and ceremonies at Delhi. One male child was born on 10.08.2022, out of the said wedlock. Due to temperamental differences, parties started living separately since 30.08.2023. It is stated that on the complaint of respondent no. 2 before the CAW Cell, Delhi, the present FIR was registered at the concerned Police Station under relevant sections. During pendency of the case, both the parties had amicably settled their disputes *vide* Compromise Deed/Memorandum of Settlement dated 06.03.2025 and had obtained decree of divorce, by way of mutual consent, before the concerned Court.

5. This Court notes that the custody of minor child is with respondent no. 2 and the future right of the child will not be affected by virtue of this compromise.

6. On a query made by this Court, respondent no. 2 who has been identified by the IO, has categorically stated that she has entered into compromise out of her own free will and without any pressure, coercion or threat. It is also stated by respondent no. 2 that the entire dispute has been amicably settled between them *vide* Compromise Deed/Memorandum of Settlement dated 06.03.2025. Respondent no. 2 further states that she has received the remaining settled amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- by way of Demand Draft bearing No. 505694 drawn on Punjab National Bank, Industrial Area, Mangolpuri, Delhi.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the affidavits showing the protection of interest of minor child as per the judgment titled



as *Ganesh vs. Sudhirkumar Shrivastava*: (2020) 20 SCC 787 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court have been filed and the same are on record. Further, petitioner no. 1 herein states that he has signed the Settlement deed having understood that he has no visitation rights to meet the son.

8. In view of the above fact that the parties have amicably resolved their differences of their own free will, and without any coercion, no useful purpose will be served by continuing the proceedings, rather the same would create further acrimony between them. It would thus be in interest of justice to quash the abovementioned FIR and the proceedings pursuant thereto. There is no legal impediment in quashing the FIR in question.

9. Accordingly, FIR bearing no. 243/2024, registered at Police Station Jafrabad, North-East Delhi, for commission of offence punishable under Sections 323/354/354(A)/506/509/498A/406/34 of IPC and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 of IPC and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

10. In view of above, the present petition stands disposed of.

11. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

JANUARY 16, 2026/ns