



\$~23

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 6252/2025**

JAGVINDER SINGH KUSHAL & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ratton K. Mishra and Mr.
Deepanshu Baliwal, Advocates for
Petitioners.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for State
with ASI Sunita, SI Preetam, P.S.
Mohan Garden.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **20.02.2026**

1. The petitioners have 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. 35/2024 dated 31.01.2024, registered at Police Station Mohan Garden, District Dwarka, New Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], and all proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.

2. Issue notice. Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Respondent No. 2 – complainant is present in person, and accepts notice.

3. Petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 were married on 10.11.2022. Due to matrimonial discord and temperamental differences between the parties, they had started living separately from 17.03.2023.

4. Respondent No. 2 lodged a formal complaint before the Crime



against Women Cell on 24.05.2023, which culminated into the impugned FIR, against four accused persons, being her husband, parents-in-law, and sister-in-law [petitioners herein]. Upon completion of investigation, a chargesheet was filed under Sections 498A/406/34/354 of the IPC. The father-in-law of respondent No. 2 [petitioner No. 2 herein] was chargesheeted under Section 354.

5. Petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 have since entered into a settlement, recorded in a Settlement Deed dated 09.05.2025. As per the settlement, the parties agreed to resume cohabitation, and to fulfill their matrimonial obligations.

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

7. Petitioner No. 1 is present in Court, and petitioner Nos. 2 to 4 are present through video conference. They are identified by their learned counsel as well as by the Investigating Officer. Respondent No. 2 is also present in person, and is identified by the Investigating Officer.

8. Respondent No. 2 has filed her no-objection affidavit before this Court. Petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 confirm that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily, without any force or coercion, and that they have been living together since approximately two months. Respondent No. 2 further submits that the allegations, including the allegation against her father-in-law [petitioner No. 2 herein] for the offence punishable under Section 354 of the IPC, arose out of a misunderstanding, and that she does not wish to pursue the same.

9. Although the offences under Sections 354 and 498A 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 the CrPC [corresponding to Section 528 of the 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.

10. 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.]

11. In the present case, the proceedings between the parties arise out of a matrimonial relationship, which has already culminated in a settlement. As petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 have since reconciled, the continuance of the criminal proceedings would only impede their married life. Respondent No. 2 has stated that the allegations under Section 354 of the IPC emanated out of a misunderstanding, in the wake of the matrimonial disputes. 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.

12. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 35/2024 dated 31.01.2024, registered at Police Station Mohan Garden, District Dwarka, New Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

13. The parties will remain bound by the terms of the settlement.

14. The petition accordingly stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

FEBRUARY 20, 2026/‘pv/KA’/