



\$~92 and 96- Q

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2850/2026, CRL.M.A. 11595/2026

AJEET SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Devansh Malhotra, Advocate
with petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF GOVT. NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP with
Inspector Satbir Singh, PS Jaitpur
Mr.Saksham Saxena, Advocate for
R-2 with R-2 in person.

+ CRL.M.C. 2869/2026, CRL.M.A. 11670/2026, CRL.M.A.
11671/2026

DESHRAJ SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Devansh Malhotra, Advocate
with petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF GOVT. NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP with
Inspector Satbir Singh, PS Jaitpur
Mr.Saksham Saxena, Advocate for
R-2 with R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

16.04.2026

1. By way of the present petitions under Section 528 of the Bharatiya



Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the respective petitioners seek quashing of: (i) FIR No. 0452/2021 dated 26.09.2021, under Sections 354B/323/506/509/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, [“IPC”] (in CRL.M.C. 2869/2026), and (ii) FIR No. 0311/2022 dated 30.05.2022, under Sections 406/498A/34 of the IPC (in CRL.M.C. 2850/2026), both registered at Police Station Jaitpur, District South East, Delhi, on the ground of settlement.

2. Issue notice. Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Saksham Saxena, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2 in both petitions.

3. The petitioners are present in Court and have been identified by their respective learned counsel, as well as by the Investigating Officer [“IO”]. Respondent No. 2 is also present in person and has been similarly identified by her learned counsel and the IO.

4. The petitions are taken up for hearing together, with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.

5. The marriage between Ajeet Singh [petitioner No. 1 in CRL.M.C. 2850/2026] & respondent No. 2 was solemnized on 29.11.2020 at Delhi, in accordance with Hindu rites and ceremonies. No child was born from the wedlock. Owing to matrimonial discord and differences in temperament, the parties have been living separately since April 2021.

6. In CRL.M.C. 2869/2026, respondent No. 2 made a formal complaint before the Crime Against Women Cell (South-East), New Delhi, against the parents and brother of her husband, alleging misbehaviour, physical assault, and sexual advances upon her, pursuant to



which FIR No. 0452/2021 came to be registered on 26.09.2021.

7. Subsequently, respondent No. 2 also lodged another complaint, alleging cruelty and dowry harassment against her husband and his family members, which culminated in FIR No. 0311/2022, which was registered on 30.05.2022 [subject matter of in CRL.M.C. 2850/2026].

8. I am informed by learned counsel for the parties that no chargesheet has been filed to date in either of the aforesaid cases.

9. During the pendency of investigation, the parties arrived at an amicable settlement before the Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, New Delhi on 22.08.2024, whereby all disputes were resolved. As per the settlement, Ajeet Singh agreed to pay a total sum of Rs. 13,00,000/- to respondent No. 2 towards full and final settlement of all her claims including maintenance, alimony, stridhan, and other dues.

10. Pursuant to the settlement, the marriage between the parties was dissolved by a decree of divorce by mutual consent by the Court of the Principal Judge, Family Courts, Saket.

11. Learned counsel for the parties submit that the allegations framed under Sections 354B/509 of the IPC in CRL.M.C. 2869/2026 arose from a misunderstanding and were incidental to minor familial disputes, devoid of any serious or lasting consequences.

14. The parties have affirmed before this Court that they have amicably resolved their disputes and no longer wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against one another.

15. In light of the foregoing, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIRs.

12. It is well settled by the Supreme Court that, in appropriate



circumstances, High Courts may, in the exercise of their inherent powers under Section 528 of the BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 of the CrPC), quash criminal proceedings, including those relating to non-compoundable offences, where a compromise has been reached between the accused and the complainant, provided that no overriding public interest would be adversely affected.

13. The Supreme Court, in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.*¹ has held as follows:

“58. Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor. No doubt, crimes are acts which have harmful effect on the public and consist in wrongdoing that seriously endangers and threatens the well-being of the society and it is not safe to leave the crime-doer only because he and the victim have settled the dispute amicably or that the victim has been paid compensation, yet certain crimes have been made compoundable in law, with or without the permission of the court. In respect of serious offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc., or other offences of mental depravity under IPC or offences of moral turpitude under special statutes, like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, the settlement between the offender and the victim can have no legal sanction at all. However, certain offences which overwhelmingly and predominantly bear civil flavour having arisen out of civil, mercantile, commercial, financial, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony, particularly relating to dowry, etc. or the family dispute, where the wrong is basically to the victim and the offender and the victim have settled all disputes between them amicably, irrespective of the fact that such offences have not been made compoundable, the High Court may within the framework of its inherent power, quash the criminal proceeding or criminal complaint or FIR if it is satisfied that on the face of such settlement, there is hardly any likelihood of the offender being convicted and by not quashing the criminal

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



proceedings, justice shall be casualty and ends of justice shall be defeated. The above list is illustrative and not exhaustive. Each case will depend on its own facts and no hard-and-fast category can be prescribed.”²

Further, in *Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.*³, the Supreme Court has also laid down guidelines for High Courts while accepting settlement deeds between parties and quashing the proceedings. The relevant observations in the said decision read as under:

“29. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we sum up and lay down the following principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or refusing to accept the settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:

29.1. Power conferred under Section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution.

29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

(i) ends of justice, or

(ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.3. Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.”⁴

14. Applying the principles discussed above to the present matters, this Court is of the view that the cases at hand constitute a fit occasion for the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction to quash the FIRs. The disputes arise from matrimonial discord, and it is evident that the parties have terminated their marital relationship and seek to move forward with their respective lives. The allegations under Sections 354B and 509 of the IPC are stated to have arisen from a misunderstanding in the course of the matrimonial disputes, and there is no indication of any element of heinous or grave criminality. In such circumstances, quashing the FIRs would serve the ends of justice by allowing the parties to live in peace and harmony, rather than prolonging discord. In view of the amicable settlement reached between the parties, the likelihood of conviction is also remote. Continuation of the criminal proceedings would, therefore, serve no useful purpose and would impose an unnecessary burden on judicial resources.

15. The settlement between the parties contemplates payment of a total

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



sum of Rs. 13,00,000/- to respondent No.2, of which Rs. 10,00,000/- have already been received by her, and the remaining Rs. 4,00,000/- has been handed over to her in Court. Consequently, the entire settlement amount has been fully received by respondent No.2. There is, therefore, no impediment to granting the relief sought.

16. In view of the foregoing, the petitions are allowed. Accordingly, FIR No. 0452/2021 dated 26.09.2021, under Sections 354B/323/506/509/34 of the IPC and FIR No. 0311/2022 dated 30.05.2022, under Sections 406/498A/34 of the IPC, both registered at Police Station Jaitpur, District South East, Delhi, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

17. The parties shall remain bound by the terms of the settlement.

18. The petitions, alongwith the pending applications, accordingly stand disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 16, 2026

SV/JM/