



\$~69

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 898/2026**
SH. ASHEESH KUMARPetitioner
Through: Counsel (appearance not given).
Petitioner in-person.

versus
STATENCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Abhijeet Kumar, Advocate for
Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyia, ASC for
State.
Inspector Devendra Kr., P.S.: Cyber
Rohini.
Mr. Dushyant Singh and Mr. Ankit
Bhanwala, Advocates for R-2.
R-2 in-person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER
% **20.03.2026**

CRL.M.A. 8523/2026 (exemption)

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed-of.

W.P.(CRL) 898/2026

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. 0002/2021 dated 28.12.2021 registered under sections 67/67(A) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and section 509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Cyber Police Station Rohini, Delhi.



2. The petition is premised on mediated settlement dated 09.09.2024 arrived at before the Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, New Delhi; and Divorce Decree dated 24.04.2025, 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. The mediated settlement encompasses the matrimonial dispute between the parties as well as the dispute that was subject matter of the FIR in the present case.
3. The petition is supported by affidavits of the petitioner, as also of respondent No. 2, alongwith proofs 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. Khushbu, respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that the settlement signed by the parties covers the subject FIR; 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. 8,50,000/-from the petitioner; out of which Rs. 5,50,000/- was paid earlier and Rs. 3,00,000/- has been paid in court today towards the closure of the subject FIR, in compliance of the terms of the settlement deed. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.



8. Mr. Abhijeet Kumar, learned counsel for Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyya, learned ASC for the State 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. While allowing the petition however, this court considers it appropriate, that by way of atonement, the petitioner shall pay costs of Rs.25,000/- to Friendicoes SECA, No.271 & 273, Defence Colony Flyover Market, Jungpura, New Delhi within 04 weeks.
11. Subject to the aforesaid condition FIR No. 0002/2021 dated 28.12.2021 registered under sections 67/67(A) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and section 509 of IPC at P.S.: Cyber Police Station Rohini, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
12. Petitioner is directed to place on record the proof of payment of costs.
13. The Registry is directed to re-list the matter if costs are not paid as directed.



14. The petition stands disposed-of.
15. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MARCH 20, 2026/ak