



\$~26

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 281/2026 & CRL.M.A. 2771/2026**

VIVEK BATRA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Md. Shariq, Mr. rishi Vohra, Mr.
Amit Kharbanda and Ms. Urvashi
Sood, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanajy Lao, Standing Counsel for
the State.
SI Vipin, P.S. Amar Colony.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

13.02.2026

%

By way of the present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with 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. 367/2022 dated 13.06.2022 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Amar Colony, New Delhi.

2. Pursuant to order dated 28.01.2026, divorce decree dated 01.11.2025 has been placed on record.
3. The petition is premised on Memorandum of Understanding dated 13.05.2025 ('MoU') signed between the parties; and Divorce Decree dated 01.11.2025, 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.

4. The petition is supported by affidavits of the petitioners, as also of respondent No. 2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
5. The petitioners 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.
6. The parties have confirmed that no child was born from the wed-lock.
7. No appeal is stated to have been filed from the divorce decree.
8. The court has queried respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that an MoU 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. 35,00,000/-from petitioner No. 1; out of which Rs. 20,00,000 /- was paid earlier and Rs. 15,00,000 /- has been paid in court today, in compliance of the terms of the MoU. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.
9. Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel (Criminal) 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, case FIR No. 367/2022 dated 13.06.2022 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the IPC at P.S.: Amar Colony, New Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
12. Petition stands disposed-of.
13. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

FEBRUARY 13, 2026

V.Rawat