



\$~37

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

+ CRL.M.C. 4340/2025

ASHISH ARORA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ritesh Oberoi, Advocate.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Naval Kishore Jha, APP.

R2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **27.02.2026**

1. The petitioner has 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. 358/2022 dated 19.04.2022, registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden, District West, New Delhi, under Sections 354/354A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], and all proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.

2. The brother of the petitioner and respondent No. 2 were married on 21.05.2017, but their marriage has since been dissolved by a decree of divorce by mutual consent, passed by the Family Court on 23.12.2024.

3. Respondent No. 2 lodged the impugned FIR against her brother-in-law [petitioner herein], as well as FIR No. 575/2022 registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden, District West, New Delhi, under Sections



498A/406/34 of the IPC, against her husband and his family members. Upon completion of the investigation, a chargesheet was filed in respect of the impugned FIR.

4. I am informed that, FIR No. 575/2022 was also registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden, District West, New Delhi, at the instance of respondent No. 2, against her husband and his family members, under Sections 498A/406/34. The said FIR, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, was quashed by this Court by order dated 31.07.2025 in CRL.M.C. 2795/2025 [*Aman Arora and Ors. v. State Govt. of NCT of Delhi and Anr.*], in terms of a settlement dated 21.05.2024.

5. The petitioner herein and respondent No. 2 have since amicably resolved their disputes, as recorded in a Memorandum of Understanding dated 21.05.2024.

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

7. The petitioner is present in person, and has been identified by his learned counsel as well as the Investigating Officer. Respondent No. 2 is also present in person, and has been identified by the Investigating Officer. She has been offered the assistance of Legal Aid Counsel, but declines the same.

8. The settlement dated 21.05.2024 was arrived at under the aegis of the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, New Delhi. It contemplates payment of a sum of Rs. 8,00,000/- to respondent No. 2. The aforesaid order dated 31.07.2025 records that a sum of Rs. 6,00,000/- was received by respondent No. 2, and the remaining amount of Rs.2,00,000/- was to be paid to her at the time of quashing of the



impugned FIR. A demand draft of the remaining amount of Rs. 2,00,000/- has been handed over to respondent No. 2 today.

9. The parties confirm that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily, without any force or coercion. Respondent No. 2 has also filed her no-objection affidavit before this Court, and submits that the allegations under Sections 354 and 354A of the IPC, arose out of a misunderstanding stemming from matrimonial strife, and that she does not wish to pursue the same.

10. Although the offences under Sections 354 and 354A 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 CrPC [corresponding to Section 528 of 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.

11. The Supreme Court, in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.* [(2012) 10 SCC 303], 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 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.”

[Emphasis supplied.]

12. In the present case, the proceedings between the parties arise out of a matrimonial relationship, which has already culminated in a decree of divorce. Further, FIR No. 575/2022, registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden, District West, New Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC, arising out of the same dispute, stands quashed. Respondent No. 2 has also stated that the allegations under Sections 354 and 354A of the IPC arose on account of the breakdown of the matrimonial relationship, and that she does not wish to pursue these allegations any further.

13. Applying the tests laid down by the Supreme Court, it may be observed that 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 its continuation would be an empty formality, adding to the burden of the justice system and consuming public resources unnecessarily.

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

15. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 358/2022 dated 19.04.2022, registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden, District West, New Delhi, under Sections 354/354A of the IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, is hereby quashed.

16. The petition stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2026
Sh/KA/