$~53

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC010517532026**

\+ CRL.M.C. 8067/2026

TRIPTI GOYAL .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sujeet Beniwal, Mr. Tushar R. Adv. alongwith Petitioner in person. Both children in person (through VC).

versus

THE STATENCT OF DELHI AND ANR .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Raghuvinder Verma, APP for the State with W/SI Divya, SI Lal Chand, PS S.B. Dairy.
Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Adv. for R-2 alongwith R-2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIMAL KUMAR YADAV

O R D E R

% 17.11.2026

Matters listed on 16.11.2026 are being taken up today as 16.11.2026 has been declared holiday on account of Chhath Puja vide notification no.110/G-4/Genl.-I/DHC dated 11.11.2026.

1. Hybrid mode.

2. The present petition has been preferred under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as "BNSS"), corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as "Cr.P.C."), seeking quashing of FIR No. 99/2020 dated 12.03.2020 registered at Police Station Shahbad Dairy, Delhi,

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 19/11/2026 at 11:40:18

under Sections 498A/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as "IPC") along with all consequent proceedings emanating therefrom.

3. The Petitioner invoked the inherent powers of this Court on the ground that the matrimonial dispute between the parties has already been settled amicably by way of a Memorandum of Understanding (hereinafter referred to as “MOU”) agreed upon by both the parties as an out of court settlement and a subsequent decree of divorce granted by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, North-District, Rohini Courts, Delhi.

4. Briefly stated, the marriage between Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 was solemnised on 17.04.2004 at Harda, Madhya Pradesh in accordance with Hindu rites and ceremonies. Out of the said wedlock, two children, namely, Ms. Shagun Goyal and Mr. Shubh Goyal, presently aged about 20 years and 19 years respectively, were born. Both children, being major, have been residing with the Petitioner. Owing to certain temperamental differences and indifferent attitudes, disputes arose between Petitioner and Respondent No. 2, resulting in their separation on 09.05.2019. Since then, the parties have been residing separately.

5. Based on the complaint made by the Petitioner, alleging harassment, cruelty and misappropriation of her stridhan and other matrimonial articles, the aforementioned FIR came to be registered against the Respondent No.2.

6. During the pendency of the aforesaid proceedings, with the intervention of family members, relatives and well-wishers, the parties were able to resolve their matrimonial disputes amicably. An MOU dated 22.05.2025 was accordingly executed between the Petitioner and Respondent No. 2. Pursuant thereto, the marriage between Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 was dissolved by a decree of divorce by mutual consent

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 19/11/2026 at 11:40:18

dated 01.10.2026 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, North-District, Rohini Courts, Delhi.

7. As per the terms of the MOU, Respondent No. 2 agreed to pay a sum of Rs. 1,20,00,000/- to the Petitioner, towards full and final settlement of all her claims, including past, present and future maintenance, permanent alimony, stridhan, dowry articles and other matrimonial claims. The settlement amount was agreed to be paid in four instalments in the manner stipulated in the MOU. It is submitted that the entire amount has been paid and nothing remains.

8. Learned counsel for both the parties submits that the settlement has been arrived at parties' own free will and without any force, pressure, coercion or undue influence. It is further submitted that the Respondent No. 2 has duly complied with his obligations under the settlement agreement and the entire settlement amount stands paid to Petitioner.

9. In view of the settlement, Petitioner has no surviving grievance against the Respondent No. 2 and does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. It is, therefore, contended that continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would rather amount to an abuse of the process of law.

10. Petitioner is present in the Court and has been duly identified by the Investigating Officer, namely, W/SI Divya and SI Lal Chand. The Respondent No. 2 is also present in the Court and the children is present through V.C. and have been identified by their learned counsels, apart from Petitioner and Respondent No.2.

11. The present petition has been filed by the Complainant *de facto* (Petitioner) submits that she has arrived at an amicable settlement with the

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 19/11/2026 at 11:40:18

Respondent No. 2 of her own free will, volition, and without any fear, pressure, coercion or undue influence from anyone. She categorically confirms having received the entire settlement amount in terms of the MOU dated 22.05.2025. In view of the fact that all inter se disputes and differences between the parties have been resolved peacefully, she submits that she does not wish to pursue the matter further and has no objection if the aforementioned FIR and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed by this Court in the exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

12. This Court has considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has perused the settlement agreement.

13. At the outset, it is pertinent to observe that the offence punishable under Section 498A IPC is non-compoundable in terms of Section 320 Cr.P.C. Petitioner has rightly invoked the inherent jurisdiction of this Court under Section 528 BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 Cr.P.C.) rather than seeking formal compounding under Section 320 Cr.P.C. The inherent jurisdiction of this Court is distinct from the statutory power to compound offences, and is preserved to prevent abuse of the process of any Court and otherwise to secure the ends of justice. Consequently, the mere fact that the offence under Section 498A IPC is non-compoundable does not, by itself, place an embargo on the exercise of inherent jurisdiction, provided the facts and circumstances justify such interference.

14. The scope of the High Court's jurisdiction under Section 482 of CrPC to quash an FIR and the criminal proceedings emanating therefrom was examined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan & Ors.,*** **(2019) 5 SCC 688.** The Hon'ble Apex Court

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 19/11/2026 at 11:40:18

reiterated that while considering a prayer for quashing on the basis of settlement, the High Court must examine the nature and gravity of the offence, the conduct of the accused, the circumstances in which the settlement has been arrived at, and whether continuation of the proceedings would serve any useful purpose. However, the power is not to be exercised mechanically merely because the parties have entered into a compromise.

15. In ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab,*** **(2012) 10 SCC 303,** Hon'ble Supreme Court held that:

> *"the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences Under Section 320 of the Code. …The High Court may quash criminal proceedings pertaining to offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim."*

16. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has, in the matter of ***K. Srinivas Rao v. D.A. Deepa*****(2013) 5 SCC 226**, held, following ***Gian Singh*** (Supra), that a High Court may quash the criminal proceedings initiated in pursuance of an FIR alleging the commission of an offence described in Section 498A of the IPC, irrespective of the fact that such an offence is non-compoundable, if the parties reach an amicable settlement.

17. In ***Naushey Ali vs. State of U.P.,*** **(2025) 4 SCC 78**, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed in paragraph 32 that proceeding with the trial, when the parties have amicably resolved the dispute, would be futile and the ends of

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 19/11/2026 at 11:40:18

justice require that the settlement be given effect to by quashing the proceedings. It would be a grave abuse of process particularly when the dispute is settled and resolved.

18. Coming back to the facts of the instant case, it is evident that the allegations forming the subject matter of the aforementioned FIR stem from the matrimonial relationship between Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 and the disputes which subsequently arose between them. The parties have now resolved their differences through a comprehensive MOU dated 22-05-2025.

19. Petitioner, at whose instance the criminal machinery was set into motion, has unequivocally affirmed the settlement. She has acknowledged receipt of the entire settlement amount and has categorically stated that she does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings and that no surviving grievance remains in that regard against the Respondent No. 2.

20. This Court is conscious that the power under Section 528 BNSS is to be exercised sparingly and with circumspection. Nevertheless, the inherent jurisdiction is intended to prevent abuse of the process of law and to secure the ends of justice. In the present case, the subsequent settlement between the parties, its implementation, the statement of Petitioner and the predominantly matrimonial character of the dispute are circumstances which, taken cumulatively, persuade this Court to exercise its inherent jurisdiction.

21. In view of the aforesaid circumstances and the fact that parties have put a quietus to the dispute, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR. Accordingly, FIR No. 99/2020 dated 12.03.2020 registered at Police Station Sahahbad Dairy, Delhi, under Sections 498A/34 IPC, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 19/11/2026 at 11:40:18

quashed qua the Respondent No. 2.

22. The petition is allowed and disposed of in the aforesaid terms. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

VIMAL KUMAR YADAV, J

NOVEMBER 17, 2026/*ny*

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 19/11/2026 at 11:40:18