



\$~81

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1055/2026**

**HARISH KUMAR SHARMA AND ORS. ....Petitioners**

Through: Mr. Anurag Bhardwaj, Mr. Nishant Bhardwaj and Ms. Kriti Kaushik, Advocates with petitioner No.1 (in-person).  
Petitioners Nos.2 to 9 via video-conferencing.

versus

**STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR. ....Respondents**

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for the State.  
ASI Santosh Kumar, P.S.: Amar Colony.  
Dr. Meenakshi Kalra, Mr. Mayank Dhiyania, Ms. Anjali Chaudhary, Ms. Amisha Mohanty and Ms. Vrinda Taneja, Advocates for R-2 with R-2 (in-person).

**CORAM:**

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

**ORDER**

%

**02.04.2026**

**CRL.M.A. 9952/2026 (exemption)**

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed-of.

**CRL.M.A. 9953/2026 (condonation of delay in re-filing)**

By way of the present application filed under section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 ('BNSS'), the petitioner seeks condonation of about 30 days' delay in *re-filing* the present petition.



2. For the reasons stated in the application, which is duly supported by affidavit, the delay is condoned.
3. The application is allowed and disposed-of.

**W.P.(CRL) 1055/2026**

4. By way of the present petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India read with section 528 of the BNSS, the petitioners, who are former husband and in-laws of the complainant/respondent No. 2, seek quashing of case FIR No. 0368/2025 dated 12.07.2025 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Amar Colony, South-East Delhi.
5. The petition is premised on Mediated Settlement Agreement dated 23.08.2025 arrived at before the Counselling Cell, Family Courts, Saket, South-East, New Delhi.
6. Upon query, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners has handed-up a copy of Divorce Decree dated 18.11.2025, 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.
7. The petition is supported by affidavits of the petitioners, as also of respondent No. 2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
8. Petitioner No. 1 as well as respondent No. 2 are present in court. Petitioners Nos. 2 to 9, being the relatives of petitioner No.1, have joined the proceedings *via* video-conferencing. Their credentials have been verified and they have also been identified by their respective counsel.



9. The parties have confirmed that one child, viz. Yuvaan Sharma was born from the wedlock, who is minor as of date.
10. No appeal is stated to have been filed from the divorce decree.
11. The court has queried respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that a mediated settlement agreement has been signed by 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. 5,00,000 /- from petitioner No. 1; out of which Rs. 3,00,000 /- was paid earlier and Rs. 2,00,000 /- 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.
12. Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned APP confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
13. 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.
14. Accordingly, case FIR No. 0368/2025 dated 12.07.2025 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the IPC at P.S.: Amar Colony, South-



East Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.

15. 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 minor child, namely Yuvaan Sharma *vis-à-vis* his parents, as may be available under law, in any manner whatsoever.
16. Petition stands disposed-of.
17. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

**ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J**

**APRIL 2, 2026**

ss