$~7

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC010973632024**

\+ CRL.M.C. 10099/2024

ANSHUL PASRICHA AND ORS .....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Mayank Dawar, Adv (through VC).
Petitioners in person (through VC).

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) AND ANR .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State with SI Mansi, PS Maurya Enclave.
Respondent No.2 in person (through VC).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIMAL KUMAR YADAV

O R D E R

% 31.10.2026

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. 691 dated 17.07.2021 registered at Police Station Maurya Enclave, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as “IPC”), along with the chargesheet filed pursuant thereto, if any, 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 04/11/2026 at 11:13:22

3. The marriage between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 was solemnised on 23.11.2019 at Delhi in accordance with Hindu rites and ceremonies. Out of the said wedlock, no child was born. Petitioners No. 2 and 3 are the parents of Petitioner No. 1. Owing to certain matrimonial differences and temperamental incompatibility, disputes arose between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2, resulting in their separation on 24.02.2020. Since then, the parties have been residing separately.

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

5. During the pendency of the aforesaid proceedings, with the intervention of family members, relatives and well-wishers, the parties were able to resolve theirmatrimonial disputes amicably. A settlement agreement dated 26.04.2023 was accordingly executed between the Petitioner No.1 and Respondent No. 2.Pursuant thereto, the marriage between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 already stands dissolved by a decree of divorce by mutual consentdated 03.05.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, North-West District, Rohini Courts, Delhi.

6. As per the terms of the settlement, Petitioner No. 1 agreed to pay a sum of Rs. 12,50,000/- to Respondent No. 2 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 settlement agreement. It is submitted that the entire settlement amount has since been paid to Respondent No. 2.

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 04/11/2026 at 11:13:22

7. The balance amount of Rs. 1,50,000/-, by way of a Demand Draft bearing No. 515906 drawn on ICICI Bank, Shalimar Bagh Branch, was handed over to Respondent No. 2 on the last date of hearing, i.e., 16.10.2026. Respondent No. 2 confirms the receipt of the said Demand Draft and the realisation of the payment thereof.

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

9. In view of the settlement, Respondent No. 2 has no surviving grievance against the Petitioners 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. Respondent No. 2 is present through video-conferencing and has been duly identified by the Investigating Officer, namely, WSI Mansi. The Petitioners are also present through video-conferencing and have been identified by their learned counsel, who too has joined through V.C.

11. Respondent No. 2 states that she has entered into the settlement out of her own free will and volition, without any fear, pressure, coercion or undue influence from any quarter. She further confirms having received the entire settlement amount of Rs.12,50,000/- in terms of the settlement agreement dated 26.04.2023. She submits that all her disputes and differences with the Petitioners have been amicably resolved and that she has no objection if 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 04/11/2026 at 11:13:22

impugned FIR and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

12. The Court has considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has perused the settlement agreement as well as the statement of Respondent No. 2 made today on V.C.

13. At the outset, it is pertinent to observe that the offences punishable under Sections 498A and 406 IPC are non-compoundable in terms of Section 320 Cr.P.C. However, the power vested in the High Court under Section 528 BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 Cr.P.C.) is distinct from the statutory power of compounding offences under Section 320 Cr.P.C. The inherent jurisdiction of the High Court 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 offences alleged are non-compoundable does not, by itself, place an embargo on the exercise of inherent jurisdiction, provided the facts and circumstances of the case justify such interference.

14. In ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court explained the distinction between compounding of offences and exercise of inherent powers by the High Court. It was observed that criminal proceedings having an overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of matrimonial relationships and family disputes, may be quashed where the parties have decided to resolve their disputes amicably. The Hon'ble Apex Court, however, cautioned that such power is to be exercised having regard to the nature and gravity of the offence and the impact of the alleged conduct on society.

15. The principles governing the exercise of inherent jurisdiction were further considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Madhya***

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 04/11/2026 at 11:13:22

***Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan & Ors.,* (2019) 5 SCC 688.** The Hon'ble Supreme Court 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. The power is not to be exercised mechanically merely because the parties have entered into a compromise.

16. More recently, in ***Navneesh Aggarwal & Ors. v. State of Haryana &Anr.,* 2025 INSC 963**, decided on 12.08.2025, the Apex Court considered criminal proceedings arising out of matrimonial discord involving Sections 406 and 498A IPC, amongst other provisions. The Court took note of the subsequent dissolution of marriage by mutual consent, the settlement between the parties and the complainant's 'no-objection' to the quashing of the proceedings. The judgment reinforces the importance of examining the subsequent developments in the matrimonial relationship while considering whether continuation of criminal proceedings would serve any legitimate purpose. Though the Hon'ble Supreme Court exercised its powers under Article 142 of the Constitution, the decision is instructive in appreciating the consequences of a comprehensive settlement in matrimonial disputes.

17. Similarly, in ***Madduri Gangaraju @ Babu Rao v. Madduri Sunanda & Ors.,* 2025 INSC 991,** decided on 30.07.2025, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while considering criminal proceedings arising out of matrimonial disputes, observed that once the parties have genuinely settled their differences, continuation of criminal proceedings, in the peculiar facts of the case, may serve no legitimate purpose and may instead result in unnecessary harassment.

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 04/11/2026 at 11:13:22

18. Reverting to the facts of the present case, it is evident that the allegations forming the subject matter of the aforementioned FIR arise out of the matrimonial relationship between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 and the disputes which subsequently developed between them. The parties have now resolved their differences through a comprehensive settlement dated 26.04.2023.

19. Respondent No. 2, 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 Petitioners.

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 Respondent No. 2 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 facts and circumstances, particularly the voluntary and comprehensive settlement between the parties, the receipt of the entire settlement amount by Respondent No. 2, her categorical no-objection to the quashing of the proceedings and the predominantly matrimonial nature of the dispute, this Court is satisfied that the continuation of the criminal proceedings would only prolong the litigation between 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 04/11/2026 at 11:13:22

parties without serving any corresponding purpose in the administration of justice.

22. Accordingly, FIR No. 691/2021 dated 17.07.2021 registered at Police Station Maurya Enclave, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, the chargesheet filed pursuant thereto, if any, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby *quashed* qua the Petitioners.

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

VIMAL KUMAR YADAV, J

OCTOBER 31, 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 04/11/2026 at 11:13:22