



\$~81

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 672/2026**

SH PIYUSH NAHATA AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Vipul Sharma, Advocate.
Petitioner No.1 in-person.
Petitioners Nos.2 and 3 *via* video-conferencing.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for the State.
SI Vineesha, P.S.: Sarojini Nagar.
Mr. Ashim S. and Ms. Radhika Gupta, Advocates for R-2.
R-2 *via* video-conferencing.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

%

27.01.2026

CRL.M.A. 2673/2026 (exemption)

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed-of.

CRL.M.C. 672/2026

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.107/2024 dated 14.02.2024 registered



under sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Sarojini Nagar, Delhi.

2. The petition is premised on mediated Settlement Agreement dated 16.07.2025 entered between the parties before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi; and Divorce Decree dated 18.10.2025, 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 is present in court. Petitioners Nos.2 and 3; and respondent No.2 have joined *via* video-conferencing. Their credentials have been verified and they have also been identified by their respective counsel.
5. The parties have agreed that no maintenance or alimony would be payable by petitioner No.1 to respondent No.2. However, learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that in the course of investigation, the custody of an almirah containing respondent No.2's belongings and valuables was handed-over to the Investigating Officer ('I.O.'). He submits that the I.O. be directed to return the almirah alongwith its belongings to respondent No.2.
6. The I.O. is present in court. She states that the almirah was left by the parties in police station and that though there is no seizure memo, they will return the almirah to respondent No.2.
7. The parties have confirmed that no child was born from the wed-lock.
8. No appeal is stated to have been filed from the divorce decree.



9. The court has queried Ms. Abhisri Roy, respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that a settlement deed has been entered into between the parties. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.
10. Ms. Richa Dhawan, learned APP confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
11. 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.
12. Accordingly, FIR No.107/2024 dated 14.02.2024 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 at P.S.: Sarojini Nagar, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
13. Petition stands disposed-of.
14. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

JANUARY 27, 2026/ak