



\$~67

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 659/2026**

MOHD. ANAS & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Noorain Ali and Mr. S.N.
Qureshi, Advocates.
Petitioners Nos.1 to 3 and Petitioner
No.5 in-person.
Petitioner No.4 *via* video-
conferencing.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for the
State.
SI Balmiki Mishra, P.S.: Bharat
Nagar.
Ms. Paripoorn Singh and Ms. Esha
Thakur, Advocates for R-2.
R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

%

27.01.2026

CRL.M.A. 2610/2026 (exemption)

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

Let requisite compliances be made within 01 week.

The application stands disposed-of.

CRL.M.C. 659/2026

By way of the present petition filed under section 528 of the
Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioners, who are the
former husband and in-laws of the complainant/respondent No. 2,



seek quashing of case FIR No. 45/2020 dated 09.03.2020 registered under sections 498A/506/509/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Ranjit Nagar, Delhi.

2. The petition is premised on Mediation Settlement dated 20.09.2025 arrived at before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.
3. The petition is supported by affidavits of the petitioners, as also of respondent No. 2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
4. Petitioners Nos. 1 to 3 and petitioner No.5 alongwith respondent No.2 are present in court. Petitioner No.4 has joined *via* video-conferencing. Their credentials have been verified; and they have also been identified by their respective counsel.
5. The parties have confirmed that one child, viz. Mohd. Ibrahim, was born from the wedlock, who is minor as of date.
6. Though parties have not placed on record any proof of their divorce, respondent No.2 states that she has received notice of *talaq* on 03 occasions, at a gap of one month each; and that she accepts those notices.
7. The court has queried Ms. Samreen, respondent No. 2, who confirms that a mediated settlement has been signed between the parties; and that in full-and-final settlement of all her claims including towards maintenance (past, present and future), *mehar/iddat*, dowry articles, jewellery, permanent alimony, etc., she was to receive a sum of Rs. 9,25,000/- from petitioner No. 1; out of which Rs. 6,00,000/- was paid earlier and Rs. 3,25,000/- has been paid in court today, in compliance



of the terms of the mediation settlement. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.

8. Ms. Richa Dhawan, learned APP confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
9. However, it is noticed that though in Mediation Settlement dated 20.09.2025, it is recorded that the minor son Mohd. Ibrahim will remain in the custody and care of his mother, there is no agreement between the parties in relation to petitioner No.1's visitation rights *vis-à-vis* his son. Petitioner No.1 states that he would want to visit his child; but respondent No.2 says that the child would not wish to meet him.
10. Be that as it may, it is clarified, that if the child is interested in meeting his father, the parties would facilitate such meetings from time-to-time, subject to logistical convenience of the parties.
11. 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 minor child, namely Mohd. Ibrahim *vis-à-vis* his father, as may be available under law, in any manner whatsoever.
12. 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.

13. Accordingly, FIR No. 45/2020 dated 09.03.2020 registered under sections 498A/506/509/34 of the IPC at P.S.: Ranjit Nagar, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
14. However, in view of the decision of a Division Bench of this court in judgment dated 07.11.2024 in MAT.APP.(F.C.) No.37/2023, no comment is made by this court on the validity or otherwise of the *talaq*.
15. Petition stands disposed-of.
16. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

JANUARY 27, 2026/ak