



\$~203

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 583/2026**

MANISH LOHAT AND ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Mahesh Kumar Sharma, Ms. Sapna Sharma, Mr. Atma Ram Sharma and Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocates.
Petitioners in-person.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel (Crl.) for the State with Mr. Abhinav Arya and Mr. Aryan Sachdeva, Advocates.
SI Ashish, P.S.: Raj Park.
Ms. Archana Kumari and Mr. Prabhanjan Jha, Advocates for R-2.
R-2 via video-conferencing.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

%

18.02.2026

CRL.M.A. 5561/2026 (exemption)

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed-of.

W.P.(CRL) 583/2026

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 mother-in-law of the complainant/respondent No. 2, seek quashing of case FIR No. 572/2024 dated 26.08.2024 registered under sections 498A/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Raj Park, Delhi.

2. The petition is premised on Memorandum of Understanding dated 09.09.2024 ('MoU') arrived at between the parties; and Divorce Decree dated 24.03.2025, 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. The petitioners are present in court; and respondent No.2 has 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 no child was born from the wed-lock.
6. No appeal is stated to have been filed from the divorce decree.
7. The court has queried respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that the MoU has been entered into between the parties; and that in full-and-final settlement of all her claims, she has received the articles including the gold and silver jewellery. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.
8. Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel 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. 572/2024 dated 26.08.2024 registered under sections 498-A/34 of IPC at P.S.: Raj Park, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
11. Petition stands disposed-of.
12. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

FEBRUARY 18, 2026/ak