



\$~133 Q

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

+ CRL.M.C. 8974/2025

RAJESH KAUSHIK & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Vishal Chauhan, Mr. Ramesh Pandey and Mr. Gauyrav Chauhan, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)
& ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP with Mr. Abhimanyu Arya, Advocate.
ASI Subhash Chand and SI Nishchay.
Appearance not given for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **13.05.2026**

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. 295/2018, dated 28.09.2018, registered at Police Station Geeta Colony, 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. Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of State, and learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2.
3. The petitioners are present in Court, and 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 her learned counsel and the



Investigating Officer.

4. The petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.

5. Petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 were married on 01.11.2009, as per Hindu rites and ceremonies, and one son was born from the wedlock on 08.10.2010. However, owing to matrimonial discord and temperamental differences between the parties, they have been living separately since 02.02.2015.

6. The impugned FIR was registered at the instance of respondent No. 2, who was, at the relevant time, the wife of petitioner No. 1, and petitioner No. 2 is his mother. Upon completion of the investigation, a chargesheet has also been filed in the matter.

7. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have thereafter entered into a settlement recorded in a Memorandum of Understanding dated 13.02.2019 [“MoU”], whereby they agreed to amicably settle all disputes for a total sum of Rs. 13,00,000/-, to be paid by petitioner No. 1 to respondent No. 2 in two instalments, i.e., Rs. 5,00,000/- at the time of recording the statement for the first motion and Rs. 8,00,000/- at the time of recording the statement for the second motion.

8. As regards the settlement, it has further been agreed that the custody of the minor child shall remain with respondent No. 2, and that respondent No. 2 and the minor child shall not raise any further claims against petitioner No. 1 arising out of the matrimonial dispute. However, since the settlement specifically limits the independent rights of the minor child, a separate statement of petitioner No. 1 has been recorded before the Court, to the effect that, notwithstanding anything contained in the



MoU, the rights, claims, and interests of the minor child shall remain unaffected and shall be protected in accordance with law. The said statement was made by him in Hindi and has been translated into English by me.

9. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily and without any coercion or undue pressure.

10. Pursuant to the settlement arrived at between the parties, the marriage has been dissolved by a decree of divorce by mutual consent, *vide* order dated 30.07.2019 passed by the Family Court in HMA No. 381/2019.

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

12. Although the offence under Section 498A of the IPC is non-compoundable, the Supreme Court has consistently held that the High Courts, in exercise of their inherent powers under Section 528 of the BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 of the CrPC), may quash criminal proceedings even in respect of such offences, where the parties have amicably settled their disputes and no larger public interest is seen to be adversely affected.

13. The Supreme Court, in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.*¹ has 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

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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.”²

Further, in *Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.*³, 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:

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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.”⁴

14. In the present case, the proceedings arise out of a matrimonial relationship between the parties, which has already culminated in a decree of divorce. Further, respondent No. 2 has categorically affirmed



before the Court that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily. In view of the principles laid down by the Supreme Court, it is evident that the continuation of the criminal proceedings is unlikely to result in conviction and would, therefore, serve no useful purpose. Rather, it would amount to an empty formality, unnecessarily burdening the justice system and consuming valuable public resources.

15. The settlement contemplates payment of a sum of Rs. 13,00,000/- to respondent No. 2, towards full and final settlement of all claims between the parties. Respondent No. 2 has stated that the entire agreed amount has already been received. In these circumstances, there appears to be no impediment to the grant of the relief sought in the present petition.

16. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 295/2018 dated 28.09.2018, registered at Police Station Geeta Colony, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

17. The parties shall remain bound by the terms of the settlement.

18. The petition, alongwith any pending applications, accordingly stands disposed of.

19. It is, however, made clear that the settlement and the present order will not, in any way, affect the rights of the minor child, whose custody remains with respondent No. 2.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 13, 2026
SS/SD/

⁴ Emphasis supplied.