



\$~68

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 742/2026**

**VIPIN KUMAR TRIPATHI**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Surendra, Ms. Anchal Dubey,  
Ms. M. Tyagi, Mr. Amit Tyagi, Ms.  
Raksha Sharma and Mr. Manoj  
Kumar, Advocates.  
Petitioner in-person.

versus

**STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel  
(Crl.) with Mr. Abhinav Kumar and  
Mr. Anjan Sachdeva, Advocates for  
the State.

SI Tej Dutt, P.S.: Hari Nagar.

Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Advocate for R-  
2.

R-2 in-person.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI**

**ORDER**

% **11.03.2026**

**W.P.(CRL) 742/2026**

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 petitioner, who is the former husband of the complainant/respondent No. 2, seeks quashing of case FIR No. 132/2025 dated 22.03.2025 registered under section 498A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Hari Nagar, Delhi.

2. The petition is premised on a Settlement Agreement dated 02.07.2025 arrived at before the Counselling Cell, Family Court, Tis Hazari Courts, West District, Delhi; and Divorce Decree dated 30.01.2026 ,



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 petitioner, as also of respondent No. 2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
4. The petitioner 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.
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 Ms. Priyanka, respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and 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. 4,00,000/- from the petitioner; out of which Rs. 2,75,000/- was paid earlier and Rs. 1,25,000/- has been paid in court today, in compliance of the terms of the settlement agreement. 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. 132/2025 dated 22.03.2025 registered under section 498A IPC at P.S.: Hari Nagar, 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**

**MARCH 11, 2026/ak**