$~94

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC010525742026**

\+ CRL.M.C. 8178/2026

SATYA PRAKASH KHATRI & ORS. .....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Mohan Sharma, Mr. Manoj Kumar and Mr Nikhil Pramod, Mr. Anmol Kr. Balian and Mr. Animesh Gaur, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR. .....Respondents

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP for State. SI Sumit, PS-KN Katju Marg.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

O R D E R

% 02.11.2026

1. This petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023[1] seeking quashing of FIR No. 326/2025 dated 10th June, 2025,[2] registered at P.S. K.N. Katju Marg, Delhi, under Sections 85/316(2)/3(5)/351 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023[3] along with all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom.

2. Petitioner No. 2 is the husband of Respondent No. 2, whereas the remaining Petitioners are her in-laws. Their marriage was solemnised on 12th November, 2024, according to Hindu rites and ceremonies. The parties have

[1] "BNSS"
[2] "impugned FIR"
[3] "BNS"

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 06/11/2026 at 12:00:29

no child from the marriage. Owing to matrimonial discord and temperamental differences, the relationship between the parties deteriorated and they have been residing separately since 25th January, 2025. Subsequently, Respondent No. 2 lodged the impugned FIR against the Petitioners, alleging cruelty, harassment and demands for dowry. Upon completion of investigation, a chargesheet was filed under Sections 85/316(2)/351(2)/356(2)/3(5) of BNS and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961.

3. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties amicably resolved their matrimonial disputes and entered into a Settlement Agreement dated 10th May, 2026, a copy whereof has been placed on record. Under the settlement, Petitioner No. 2 agreed to pay INR 15 lakh to Respondent No. 2 towards full and final settlement of all her claims. It is stated in the Settlement Agreement that the parties have entered into the settlement voluntarily, without any force or coercion. Pursuant to the settlement, the parties have obtained a decree of divorce by mutual consent dated 9th June, 2026, from the Family Court, Rohini, Delhi.

4. Respondent No. 2, who appears in person and has been duly identified by the Investigating Officer, confirms that she has amicably settled all her disputes with the Petitioners. She acknowledges receipt of INR 10 lakh towards the settlement amount. The balance amount of INR 5 lakh has been handed over to her today by way of a Demand Draft, which she accepts and acknowledges. She further confirms that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily, without any force, pressure or coercion, and that she has no objection to the quashing of the impugned FIR and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom.

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 06/11/2026 at 12:00:29

5. The Court has considered the aforesaid facts and submissions. Notably, the offences under Section 85 of BNS and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 are non-compoundable, whereas the offences under Sections 316(2), 351(2) and 356(2) of the BNS are compoundable in certain cases.

6. It is well settled that the power of the High Court under Section 482 CrPC [corresponding to Section 528 BNSS] to quash criminal proceedings is distinct from the power of compounding under Section 320 CrPC. This power may be exercised even in cases involving non-compoundable offences where the parties have settled the matter. However, the power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution, having regard to the nature and gravity of the offence and the circumstances of the case. In ***Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.***[4], the Supreme Court held that criminal cases having an overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of matrimonial relationships or family disputes, stand on a distinct footing where the parties have resolved their entire disputes. The Court further held that, in such cases, the High Court may quash the proceedings where, having regard to the settlement, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak, and continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose. These principles have similarly been reiterated in ***Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur & Ors. v. State of Gujarat & Anr***[5]**.**

7. Considering the nature of the dispute, the amicable settlement between the parties, the fact that the settlement has been acted upon and the

[4] (2014) 6 SCC 466.
[5] (2017) 9 SCC 641.

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 06/11/2026 at 12:00:29

subsequent dissolution of the marriage by mutual consent, this Court is of the opinion that the present case is a fit case for exercise of jurisdiction under Section 528 BNSS. Continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would only amount to an abuse of the process of the Court.

8. Accordingly, the impugned FIR No. 0326/2025 dated 10th June, 2025, and all proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.

9. The parties shall abide by the terms of settlement.

10. The present petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 2, 2026
nk

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 06/11/2026 at 12:00:29