



\$~66

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 208/2026**

SH SANDEEP HOODA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Nadeem Saifi and Mr. Sachin
Gupta, Advocates for petitioners.
P-1 *via* video-conferencing
P-2 in-person.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for
State.
SI Satish Kumar, P.S.: Mongolpuri.
Mr. Ravinder Dahiya, Advocate for
R-2 with R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

%

20.01.2026

CRL.M.A. 1990/2026 (exemption)

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed-of.

W.P.(CRL) 208/2026

By way of the present petition filed under Articles 226/227
of the Constitution of India read with section 528 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioners, who are the former



husband and mother-in-law of the complainant/respondent No. 2, seek quashing of case FIR No. 193/2020 dated 13.03.2020 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Mangolpuri, Delhi.

2. The petition is premised on Mutual Settlement Deed dated 29.09.2025 signed between the parties; and Divorce Decree dated 16.12.2025, which is the culmination of petitions under sections 13B(1) and 13B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act 1955, whereby the parties had sought dissolution of their marriage by mutual consent.
3. The petition is supported by affidavits of the petitioners, as also of respondent No. 2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
4. Petitioner No.1 has joined the proceedings *via* video-conferencing since he is presently in Canada; and is otherwise acting through petitioner No. 2 (his special power of attorney holder and mother). Petitioner No.2 as well as respondent No.2 are present in court. Their credentials have been verified and they have also been identified by their respective counsel.
5. The parties have confirmed that two children, viz. Diya and Vinayak, were born from the wedlock, who are major as of date; and are presently residing with respondent No.2.
6. No appeal is stated to have been filed from the divorce decree.
7. Parties also jointly inform the court that petitioner No.1's father (*i.e.* husband of petitioner No.2), Mr. Raj Kapoor has passed-away on 27.10.2024; and for that reason he is not a party to the present proceedings, though he was named in the FIR. A copy of his death certificate has been appended to the petition.



8. The court has queried Ms. Monika, respondent No.2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that a settlement deed has been signed between the parties; and that in full-and-final settlement of all her claims including towards maintenance (past, present and future), *stridhan*, dowry articles, jewellery, permanent alimony, etc., she was to receive a sum of Rs.50,00,000/-from petitioner No.1; out of which Rs. 30,00,000/- was paid earlier and Rs. 20,00,000/- has been paid in court today, in compliance of the terms of the settlement. Respondent No.2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.
9. Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
10. In the circumstances, in line with the law laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2012) 10 SCC 303 as also in ***Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2014) 6 SCC 466, this court sees no reason why the subject FIR and all proceedings emanating therefrom should not be quashed. This court is of the view that in light of the settlement between the contesting parties, continuing with the subject FIR and all subsequent proceedings would be an exercise in futility and would not be conducive to peace and harmony between the parties.
11. Accordingly, FIR No.193/2020 dated 13.03.2020 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the IPC at P.S.: Mangolpuri, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
12. Needless to add that the settlement between the parties leading to the closure of all criminal proceedings by way of the present order will in



no way affect the property rights and other rights of the children, namely Diya and Vinayak, *vis-à-vis* their father, as may be available under law, in any manner whatsoever.

13. Petition stands disposed-of.
14. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

JANUARY 20, 2026/ak