



\$~92

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

+ CRL.M.C. 981/2026 & CRL.M.A. 3865/2026
SANAY @ SANAY KATARIYA & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Aman Singh, Mr. Sandeep Singh,
Mr. Shashikant, Advocates with
petitioners.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP with SI
Parveen.
Mr. Nitin Kumar, Advocate for R2
with R2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

05.02.2026

1. Issue notice. Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Nitin Kumar, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2 – complainant.
2. By way of the present petition, the petitioners have approached this Court under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ["BNSS"] (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ["CrPC"]), seeking quashing of FIR No. 918/2021 dated 30.12.2021, registered at Police Station New Usmanpur, District North East, New Delhi, for offences punishable under Sections 498A/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], read with Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 ["DP Act"], on the basis of an amicable settlement arrived at between the parties.



3. Petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 were married on 19.06.2017. Owing to temperamental differences, the parties could not cohabit harmoniously and have been living separately since 08.08.2020. No child has been born from the said wedlock.

4. Subsequent to leaving the matrimonial home, respondent No. 2 lodged a complaint before the Crime Against Women Cell on 10.08.2020, which culminated in the registration of the impugned FIR, against her husband and his family members.

5. Upon completion of the investigation, a chargesheet was filed against five accused persons [petitioners herein] under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC, read with Section 4 of the DP Act. Although respondent No. 2's statement under Section 164 of the CrPC contained allegations under Section 376 of the IPC against one of the family members and under Section 377 of the IPC against her husband, those allegations are not part of the present proceedings, and cognizance has been taken only under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC, read with Section 4 of the DP Act.

6. The parties have since amicably resolved their disputes, as recorded in a Deed of Settlement dated 20.12.2023, entered into between petitioner No.1 and respondent No. 2. In view of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR and all proceedings emanating therefrom.

7. The petitioners are present before this Court and have been duly identified by their learned counsel as well as by the Investigating Officer ["IO"]. Respondent No. 2 is also present in Court, and has been identified by her learned counsel and the IO.

8. Pursuant to the settlement, the marriage between petitioner No.1 and respondent No. 2 has been dissolved by a decree of divorce by mutual



consent, passed by the Family Court on 21.08.2024.

9. The settlement contemplates payment of a sum of Rs. 4,90,000/-, alongwith the return of certain articles, to respondent No. 2 by petitioner No.1, towards full and final settlement of all claims arising out of the matrimonial relationship. Respondent No. 2, who is present in Court and represented by counsel, confirms that she has received the said amount and articles.

10. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily, and without any coercion, undue influence, or pressure.

11. Although offences under Section 498A of the IPC and Section 4 of the DP Act are non-compoundable in nature, the Supreme Court has unequivocally held that, in appropriate cases, the High Courts may exercise their inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 of the CrPC [corresponding to Section 528 of the BNSS] to quash criminal proceedings even in respect of non-compoundable offences, where the dispute has been amicably settled between the accused and the complainant, and where such quashing does not impinge upon any overriding public interest. Reference in this connection can be made to the judgment in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.* [(2012) 10 SCC 303], which held as follows:

“58. Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor. No doubt, crimes are acts which have harmful effect on the public and consist in wrongdoing that seriously endangers and threatens the well-being of the society and it is not safe to leave the crime-doer only because he and the victim have settled the



dispute amicably or that the victim has been paid compensation, yet certain crimes have been made compoundable in law, with or without the permission of the court. In respect of serious offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc., or other offences of mental depravity under IPC or offences of moral turpitude under special statutes, like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, the settlement between the offender and the victim can have no legal sanction at all. However, certain offences which overwhelmingly and predominantly bear civil flavour having arisen out of civil, mercantile, commercial, financial, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony, particularly relating to dowry, etc. or the family dispute, where the wrong is basically to the victim and the offender and the victim have settled all disputes between them amicably, irrespective of the fact that such offences have not been made compoundable, the High Court may within the framework of its inherent power, quash the criminal proceeding or criminal complaint or FIR if it is satisfied that on the face of such settlement, there is hardly any likelihood of the offender being convicted and by not quashing the criminal proceedings, justice shall be casualty and ends of justice shall be defeated. The above list is illustrative and not exhaustive. Each case will depend on its own facts and no hard-and-fast category can be prescribed.”

[Emphasis supplied.]

Further, in *Narinder Singh and Ors. v. State of Punjab and Anr.* [(2014) 6 SCC 466], the Supreme Court has also laid down guidelines for High Courts while accepting settlement deeds between parties and quashing the proceedings. The relevant observations in the said decision read as under:

“29. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we sum up and lay down the following principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or refusing to accept the settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:

29.1. Power conferred under Section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution.

29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis



petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

(i) ends of justice, or

(ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.3. Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.”

[Emphasis supplied.]

12. In the present case, the proceedings between the parties arise out of a matrimonial relationship, which has already culminated in a decree of divorce. Applying the tests laid down by the Supreme Court, it may be observed that the respondent No. 2 has also categorically affirmed the voluntary nature of the settlement before the Court. In these circumstances, the criminal proceedings are unlikely to result in conviction, and its continuation would be an empty formality, adding to the burden of the justice system and consuming public resources unnecessarily.

13. As noted above, the amount of Rs. 4,90,000/- as well as the articles mentioned in the settlement have been given to respondent No. 2. There is, therefore, no impediment to the grant of the relief sought.



14. In view of the foregoing, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 918/2021 dated 30.12.2021, registered at Police Station New Usmanpur, District North East, New Delhi, for offences punishable under Sections 498A/34 of the IPC, read with Section 4 of the DP Act, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

15. The parties shall remain bound by the terms of the settlement.

16. The petition accordingly stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

FEBRUARY 5, 2026

“Bhupi/KA”/