



\$~60

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

+ CRL.M.C. 1245/2026 & CRL.M.A. 5034/2026

ANIL KUMAR SHARMA & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Deepak Parashar & Ms. Neha,
Advocates.

versus

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

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State.
Mr. Prakhar Singh & Ms. Anjali
Prakash, Advocates for R-2.
SI Manish Giri, PS GTB Enclave
ASI Asha Rani, PS Seelam Pur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

13.02.2026

1. The petitioners have filed this petition 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. 382/2020 dated 28.12.2020, registered at Police Station G.T.B. Enclave, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], and all proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.
2. Issue notice. Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Prakhar Singh, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2.
3. The petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of learned



counsel for the parties.

4. The petitioners are present in Court, and are identified by their learned counsel, as well as by the Investigating Officer [“IO”]. Respondent No. 2 is also present in person, and is identified by her learned counsel and the IO.

5. The impugned FIR is registered at the instance of respondent No.2, who was the wife of petitioner No. 1. Petitioner No. 2 is the father of petitioner No. 1 and petitioner No. 3 is the sister of petitioner No.1.

6. The petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 were married on 18.04.2018. Due to matrimonial discord and temperamental differences between the parties, they have been living separately since 15.07.2020. No child was born from the wedlock.

7. Respondent No. 2 lodged a formal complaint before the Crime against Women Cell on 18.08.2020, and the same culminated into the impugned FIR, against her husband, father-in-law, mother-in-law, and sister-in-law.

8. During the pendency of the investigation, the mother-in-law of respondent No. 2 passed away, and proceedings against her stand abated. A death certificate has also been placed on record.

9. A chargesheet was subsequently filed on 15.06.2022, against petitioner Nos. 1 and 2. Petitioner No. 3 however was not charge sheeted.

10. The parties have settled all their disputes, as recorded in a Settlement Agreement dated 14.04.2025 was executed between them.

11. The Settlement Agreement states that the parties have amicably resolved their disputes, and have restored matrimonial relations. I am informed that the parties have been residing together since 30.04.2025.



However, the Settlement Agreement contains certain clauses imposing restrictions upon respondent No. 2, which appear to be unreasonable and implausible, including a stipulation requiring respondent No. 2 to obtain prior permission from petitioner No. 1 to visit her parental home. It also contains certain stipulations regarding the place of residence of her son from a previous marriage, who has since attained majority. Mr. Deepak Parashar, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the said clause was inadvertently incorporated and does not reflect the true intent or understanding between the parties. In this regard, an affidavit dated 13.02.2026 has been handed up, clarifying that the aforesaid clause stands deleted. The said affidavit is taken on record. Accordingly, the Settlement Agreement shall stand modified, to the extent indicated in the affidavit dated 13.02.2026.

12. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily and without any coercion or undue pressure.

13. In light of the aforesaid, parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR.

14. Although the offence under Section 498A of IPC is non-compoundable, the Supreme Court has clearly held that, in certain circumstances, the High Courts, in exercise of their powers under Section 528 of BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 of CrPC), can quash criminal proceedings, even with respect to non-compoundable offences, on the ground that there is a compromise between the accused and the complainant, especially when no overarching public interest is adversely affected.



15. The Supreme Court, in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.*¹ has 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.”²

Further, in *Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.*³, the Supreme Court has also laid down guidelines for High Courts while

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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.”⁴

16. In the present case, the proceedings between the parties arise out of a matrimonial relationship, which stands resolved, and the parties have since been residing together for nine months approximately. 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.

17. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 382/2020 dated 28.12.2020, registered at Police Station G.T.B. Enclave, under Sections 498A/406/34 of IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

18. The petition accordingly stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

FEBRUARY 13, 2026

‘pv’/AD/

⁴ Emphasis supplied.