



\$~109 & 116 Q

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3239/2026 & CRL.M.A. 13166/2026

RENU HOON @ REENU HOON & ANR.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prafulla, Mr. Devendra Kumar Gupta, Mr. Kuldeep Singh and MS. Aarti Bansiwali, Advocates with petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE(GNCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondent

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for State with SI Harish, PS Maurya Enclave.
Mr. Rohit Goel and Mr. Abhishek, Advocates for R2 with R2 in person.

+ CRL.M.C. 3255/2026 & CRL.M.A. 13229/2026

SATPAL SINGH HOON & ORS.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rohit Goel and Mr. Abhishek, Advocates with petitioners in person.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondent

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for State.
Mr. Prafulla, Mr. Devendra Kumar Gupta, Mr. Kuldeep Singh and Ms. Aarti Bansiwali, Advocates for R2 with R2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN



ORDER

28.04.2026

%

1. The petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 [“BNSS”] (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 [“CrPC”]), seeking quashing of FIR No. 544/2017 dated 12.10.2017, registered at Police Station Keshav Puram, District North-West, Delhi, under Sections 380/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 [“IPC”] [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 3239/2026], and FIR No. 1316/2021 dated 21.12.2021, registered at Police Station Maurya Enclave, District North-West, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 3255/2026], alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. Issue notice. Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Rohit Goel, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2 – complainant in CRL.M.C. 3239/2026. Mr. Prafulla, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2 – complainant in CRL.M.C. 3255/2026.
3. For ease of reference, the parties shall hereinafter be described by their status in CRL.M.C. 3255/2026.
4. The marriage between petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 [petitioner No. 1 in CRL.M.C. 3239/2026] was solemnised on 12.05.1989. Two children were born from the wedlock. However, owing to matrimonial discord and temperamental differences, the parties have been living separately since 2004.
5. Subsequently, FIR No. 544/2017 dated 12.10.2017 was registered



at the instance of petitioner No. 2, who is the brother of petitioner No. 1, against respondent No. 2 and her son [petitioner No. 2 in CRL.M.C. 3239/2026], alleging theft. Upon completion of the investigation, a chargesheet was filed under Sections 380/411/34 of the IPC.

6. Respondent No. 2 also lodged a formal complaint with the Crime Against Women Cell on 22.06.2021, which led to the registration of FIR No. 1316/2021 dated 21.12.2021, against her husband and brothers-in-law [petitioners in CRL.M.C. 3255/2026], alleging cruelty and demands of dowry. Upon completion of the investigation, a chargesheet was filed under Sections 498A/406 of the IPC against petitioner No. 1.

7. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have amicably resolved their disputes under the aegis of the Delhi Mediation Centre, Rohini District Courts, Delhi, as recorded in a comprehensive Settlement/Agreement dated 12.06.2025.

8. In light of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR.

9. The parties are present in Court, and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel as well as the Investigating Officer.

10. Pursuant to the settlement, the marriage between petitioner No.1 and respondent No. 2 has been dissolved by a decree of divorce by mutual consent, passed by the Family Court on 22.12.2025.

11. The Settlement/Agreement dated 12.06.2025 contemplates payment of a sum of Rs. 39,00,000/- by petitioner No. 1 to respondent No. 2 towards full and final settlement of all disputes. I am informed that the said amount has been paid.

12. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that the settlement has been



arrived at voluntarily, and without any coercion, undue influence, or pressure. Affidavits of the respective complainants, signifying their no-objection to the quashing of the impugned FIRs and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, have also been placed on record.

13. Although the offences under Sections 380 and 498A of the IPC are non-compoundable, the Supreme Court has clearly held that, in certain circumstances, the High Courts, in exercise of their powers under Section 482 of the CrPC [corresponding to Section 528 of the BNSS], can quash criminal proceedings, even with respect to non-compoundable offences, on the ground that there is a compromise between the accused and the complainant, especially when no overarching public interest is adversely affected.

14. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.* [(2012) 10 SCC 303], the Supreme Court 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 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.”

[Emphasis supplied.]

Further, in *Narinder Singh and Ors. v. State of Punjab and Anr.* [(2014) 6 SCC 466], 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 quiding 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 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.”

[Emphasis supplied.]

15. 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. 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.

16. As noted above, the settlement amount of Rs. 39,00,000/- has been paid to respondent No. 2. There is, therefore, no impediment to grant of the relief sought.

17. In view of the foregoing, the petitions are allowed. Accordingly, FIR No. 544/2017 dated 12.10.2017, registered at Police Station Keshav Puram, District North-West, Delhi, under Sections 380/34 of the IPC [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 3239/2026], and FIR No. 1316/2021 dated



21.12.2021, registered at Police Station Maurya Enclave, District North-West, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 3255/2026], alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

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

19. The petitions, alongwith pending applications, stand disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 28, 2026

'pv/KA'/'