



\$~98 Q

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4122/2026**

NASEEMA KHATOON & ORS.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mohd. Kaish, Mr. Mohd.
Talha Mumtaz, Advocates

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP with Mr.
Abhimanyu Arya, Advocate with
SI Ujjwal Rana and ASI Rajiv
Singh
Mr. Sahil Sharma and Mr. Akash,
Advocates for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **22.05.2026**

CRL.M.A. 16656/2026 (exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 4122/2026

1. By way of 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. 235/2019, dated 11.09.2019 registered under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at P.S. Budh Vihar, District Rohini, Delhi, and all proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.



2. Issue notice. Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor accepts notice on behalf of State. Mr. Sahil Sharma, learned counsel, has entered appearance on behalf of respondent No. 2.
3. The petitioners are present in Court, and are identified by their learned counsel as well as by the Investigating Officer [“IO”]. Respondent No. 2 is also present in Court, and is identified by her learned counsel and the IO.
4. The petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.
5. The impugned FIR is registered at the instance of respondent No. 2, who was the wife of petitioner No. 2. Petitioners Nos. 1 & 3 are the parents of petitioner No. 2.
6. The marriage between petitioner No. 2 and respondent No. 2 was solemnised on 11.10.2015, according to Muslim rites and customs. Due to matrimonial discord and differences in temperament, the parties have been living separately since 08.05.2018. No child was born from the wedlock.
7. Respondent No. 2 lodged a formal complaint before the Crime Against Women Cell, Rohini, against the petitioners, alleging physical and mental harassment over demands of dowry, which culminated in the registration of the subject FIR on 11.09.2019.
8. Upon completion of the investigation, a chargesheet was filed on 10.08.2022, wherein an offence under Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, was added against petitioner No. 2.
9. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have entered into a settlement, recorded in a Deed of Talaq by way of Mubarat (Mutual



Consent) dated 17.02.2025, whereby all matrimonial disputes between them have been amicably resolved. The parties have agreed to dissolve their marriage by mutual consent in accordance with Muslim Law and have settled all claims relating to maintenance, permanent alimony, dowry articles, Mehar, and other past and future claims. It has further been agreed that petitioner No. 2 shall pay a total settled amount of Rs. 1,35,000/- to respondent No. 2 in full and final settlement. Respondent No. 2 has also agreed to cooperate in the withdrawal/quashing of all pending litigations between them.

10. I am informed by learned counsel for the parties that pursuant to the settlement, the marriage has been dissolved by mutual consent in accordance with Muslim Law.

11. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily and without any coercion or undue pressure.

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

13. Even in cases involving non-compoundable offences, the Supreme Court has consistently held that, in appropriate cases, the High Court may exercise its inherent jurisdiction to quash an FIR and the proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of a settlement between the parties. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.*¹, 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

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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 settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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

14. In the present case, the proceedings between the parties arise out of a matrimonial relationship, which has already culminated in divorce. Applying the tests laid down by the Supreme Court, it may be observed



that the respondent No. 2 has also categorically affirmed the voluntary nature of the settlement before the Court. In these circumstances, the criminal proceedings are unlikely to result in conviction, and their continuation would be an empty formality, adding to the burden of the justice system and consuming public resources unnecessarily.

15. The settlement contemplates the payment of a sum of Rs. 1,35,000/-. The entire amount has already been received by respondent No. 2, alongwith certain articles. There is therefore no impediment to the grant of the relief sought.

16. In view of the foregoing, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 235/2019, dated 11.09.2019, registered under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at P.S. Budh Vihar, District Rohini, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

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

18. The petition, accordingly, stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 22, 2026

Sv/JM/

⁴ Emphasis supplied.