



\$~135

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4149/2026**

PARAS BHATIA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Bhumika Aggarwal, Advocate.
Petitioners Nos.1 and 2 in-person.
Petitioners Nos.3 and 4 *via* video-conferencing.
Ms. Kanika Vohra, Proxy Counsel.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for the State.
SI Rinki, P.S.: KNK Marg.
Mr. Malay Swapnil, Advocate for R-2.
R-2 in-person.
Mr. Saksham Gupta, Proxy Counsel.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

% **25.05.2026**

The Delhi High Court Bar Association has called for abstention from work today. Accordingly, proxy counsel have been deputed to appear in court.

CRL.M.A. 16768/2026 (exemption)

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed-of.

CRL.M.C. 4149/2026

By way of the present petition filed under section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioners, who are the former husband and in-laws of the complainant/respondent No. 2, seek quashing of case FIR No.0333/2020 dated 27.09.2020 registered



under sections 406/498A/354/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: K. N. Katju Marg, Delhi. Consequent upon completion of investigation, chargesheet dated 04.06.2024 has been filed in the matter.

2. The petition is premised on Divorce Decree dated 06.04.2026, 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; and the terms of settlement as contained in judgment dated 06.04.2026 passed by the learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Ludhiana in the aforesaid petition seeking dissolution of marriage by mutual consent.
3. The petition is supported by affidavits of the petitioners, as also of respondent No. 2.
4. Petitioners Nos.1 and 2 as well as respondent No. 2 are present in court. Petitioners Nos. 3 and 4 have joined *via* video-conferencing. Their credentials have been verified and they have also been identified by their respective counsel.
5. The parties have confirmed that one son, who is minor as of date, was born from the wedlock.
6. No appeal is stated to have been filed from the divorce decree.
7. The court has queried respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that the parties have settled the matter; 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. 08 lacs, which sum has been received by her. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.

8. Ms. Richa Dhawan, learned APP confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
9. 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.
10. Accordingly, FIR No. 0333/2020 dated 27.09.2020 registered under sections 406/498A/354/506/34 of the IPC at P.S.: K.N. Katju Marg, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
11. Though the terms of the settlement record that the minor child shall remain in the custody of respondent No.2 and that petitioner No. 1 would not seek custody of his son, it is made clear that nothing in the settlement would affect the rights of the minor son to meet his father, if and when he so desires, subject to logistical convenience of the parties.
12. 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 their son *vis-à-vis* his parents, as may be available under law, in any manner whatsoever.



13. Petition stands disposed-of in the above terms.
14. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MAY 25, 2026/ak