



\$~125-Q

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3740/2026 & CRL.M.A. 15182/2026**

RADHEY SHYAM & ORS.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Zaheer Ahmad and Mr. Raj
Kumar, Advocates with Petitioners
in person.

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP with SI Anil,
SI P. Sharma.
Mr. Saleem Khan, Advocate for R2
with R2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **13.05.2026**

1. The petitioners have filed this petition 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. 1774/2014 dated 12.12.2024, registered at Police Station Seemapuri, District North-East, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 ["the DP Act"], and all proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.

2. Issue notice. Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Saleem Khan,



learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2 – complainant.

3. The parties are present in Court, and have been duly identified by their respective counsel as well as the Investigating Officer. The petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.

4. The son of petitioner Nos. 1 and 2, Yashpal, and respondent No. 2 were married on 04.12.2011. However, owing to matrimonial discord and temperamental differences, the parties have been living separately since 2012. No child was born from the wedlock.

5. Subsequently, respondent No. 2 lodged a complaint before the Crime Against Women Cell, pursuant to which the impugned FIR was registered. Upon completion of the investigation, a chargesheet was filed.

6. Although eight accused persons were named in the FIR, charges have been framed only against the petitioners herein, namely, the parents-in-law, sisters-in-law and brother-in-law of respondent No. 2. I am informed that the husband of respondent No. 2 has remained untraceable for the last ten years. In this regard, petitioner No. 1 lodged a missing person report dated 27.05.2016 at Police Station Seemapuri, Delhi.

7. During the pendency of the proceedings, the petitioners and respondent No. 2 entered into a settlement dated 14.11.2025, under the aegis of the Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi. The settlement records that the husband of respondent No. 2 was declared a proclaimed offender by order dated 30.04.2019.

8. In these circumstances, although the husband is not a party to the settlement, which records that respondent No. 2 has resolved the disputes



only with the petitioners herein, Mr. Khan states, upon instructions, that respondent No. 2 does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against any of the accused persons, including her husband. He further submits that although the settlement does not contemplate any monetary payment, respondent No. 2 is satisfied with the terms thereof.

9. The statement of respondent No. 2, affirming that she has no objection to the quashing of the impugned FIR in its entirety, has been recorded in Court. The statement was made in Hindi, and has been translated into English by me.

10. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence.

11. In view of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR.

12. Although the offence under Section 498A of the IPC and Section 4 of the DP Act 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. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.*¹, the 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

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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.”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

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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 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

13. In the present case, the proceedings between the parties arise out of a matrimonial relationship, which has already culminated in a settlement. The husband of respondent No. 2 has also been untraceable since the last ten years. Applying the tests laid down by the Supreme Court, it may be observed that respondent No. 2 has also categorically affirmed the

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



voluntary nature of the settlement before the Court. In these circumstances, the criminal proceedings are unlikely to result in conviction, and its continuation would be an empty formality, adding to the burden of the justice system and consuming public resources unnecessarily.

14. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 1774/2014 dated 12.12.2024, registered at Police Station Seemapuri, District North-East, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC, and Section 4 of the DP Act, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

15. The parties will remain bound by the terms of the settlement.

16. The petition, alongwith pending application, is accordingly disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 13, 2026

tg/KA/