



\$~20

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 1116/2026 & CRL.M.A. 4414/2026**

CHANDRA BHUSHAN GUPTA & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sushant Siddharth, Mr. Sohan Singh Negi and Mr. Amreen, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for the State.
SI Rahul Rathi, P.S.: Sangam Vihar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

08.04.2026

%

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. 388/2012 dated 26.09.2012 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Sangam Vihar, South-East District, Delhi.

2. The petition is premised on Mediated Settlement Agreement dated 17.12.2021 arrived at through mediation before the Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, New Delhi.
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 as well as respondent No. 2 are present in court, petitioners Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 have 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. Mahi, was born from the wedlock, who is minor as of date.
6. Respondent No. 2 has obtained an *ex-parte* divorce decree dated 13.03.2020 against petitioner No.1 on the ground of desertion and cruelty. No appeal has been filed against the said divorce decree. Petitioner No. 1 confirms that he does not propose to file any such appeal.
7. The court has queried respondent No. 2, who confirms that a settlement agreement has been entered into 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. 18,50,000/- from petitioner No. 1; out of which Rs. 12,50,000/- was paid earlier and Rs. 6,00,000/- has been paid in court today. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.
8. Mr. Shoaib Haider, learned APP confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
9. 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.

10. Accordingly, FIR No. 388/2012 dated 26.09.2012 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 at P.S.: Sangam Vihar, South-East District, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
11. The parties have agreed that their minor daughter will remain in the custody of the mother and the father will never claim the custody of the daughter. However parties have also agreed that the father may meet the child with the prior permission of the mother.
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 minor child, namely Mahi *vis-à-vis* their parents, 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

APRIL 8, 2026/hb