



\$~81

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2178/2026

JONU KUMAR & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Kiran Singh, Advocate with Ms.
Anju Anil, Advocate.
Petitioners in-person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP for the State.
Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate with Mr.
Raushan Kumar, Advocate for
respondent No.2 and R-2 in-person..
S.I. Sandeep, P.S: Bindapur with ASI
Shri Krishan, CAW Cell, Dwarka.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

% **24.03.2026**

CRL.M.A. 8984/2026

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed-of.

CRL.M.C. 2178/2026

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.1007/2021 dated 14.12.2021 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Bindapur, Dwarka, Delhi.

2. The petition is premised on Settlement dated 16.07.2025 arrived at through counselling before the Counselling Cell, Family Courts, Dwarka, New Delhi; and Divorce Decree dated 02.12.2025, 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 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 one child, viz. *Shanaya*, was born from the wedlock, who is minor as of date.
6. No appeal is stated to have been filed from the divorce decree.
7. The court has queried Ms. Bhawna Verma, respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that a settlement 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.86,00,000/- from petitioner No.1; out of which Rs. 55,00,000/- was paid earlier and Rs. 31,00,000/- has been paid in court today, in compliance of the terms of the settlement. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.
8. Furthermore, as agreed by the parties in clause 4 of the settlement, the sum of Rs.30,00,000/- paid by petitioner No.1 to respondent No.2 at the stage of the second motion (in the mutual consent divorce petition) is to be retained in the form of a fixed deposit receipt by respondent No.2 in



the name of the minor daughter Shanaya, which is to be used for her higher education/marriage.

9. Ms. Kiran Bairwa, learned APP confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
10. 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.
11. Accordingly, case FIR No.1007/2021 dated 14.12.2021 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the IPC at P.S.: Bindapur, Dwarka, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
12. Though the settlement deed also records that the minor daughter shall remain in the custody of respondent No.2 and petitioner No.1 shall have visitation rights to meet the minor daughter *once a year*, it is made clear that nothing in this settlement would affect the rights of the minor daughter to meet her father, if and when she so desires, subject to logistical convenience of the parties.
13. 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 daughter,



namely Shanaya *vis-à-vis* her parents, as may be available under law,
in any manner whatsoever.

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

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MARCH 24, 2026
ds