



\$~6

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Date of Decision: 05th January, 2026*

+ CRL.M.C. 8/2026 & CRL.M.A. 15/2026

ARTI KOHLI & ANR.

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Saloni Kumari Singh and Mr.
Bhuvnesh Mittal, Advocates (Through
VC)

versus

STATE OF NCT. OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, APP
Mr. Banamali Shukla, Advocate along
with Respondent No. 2
Husband of Respondent No. 2
SI Babita, PS Mukherjee Nagar

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

CRL.M.A. 15/2026 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 8/2026

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of FIR No. 453/2016 dated 24.04.2016, for commission of offences under Sections 323, 354, 451, 506, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Mukherjee Nagar, along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties have amicably settled all their disputes before the *Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi* on 07.11.2024. He submits that respondent no. 2 has



also placed on record an affidavit dated 10.12.2025, expressing no objection to the quashing of the present FIR. He also submits that not only the present matter, one another criminal case bearing FIR No. 70/2021 dated 21.02.2021, for the alleged offences under Sections 420, 120B, 506(1) of IPC, registered at P.S. Timar Pur, has also been amicably settled between the parties and quashed by Co-ordinate bench of this Court *vide* order dated 24.12.2025.

3. He supplements that keeping in view the fact that the parties have amicably settled their disputes and differences arising out of misunderstanding, further continuation of proceedings would be a futile exercise and would cause undue hardship to all concerned.

4. IO/SI Babita is present and identifies the complainant. She further informs the Court that, initially, there were three accused persons. However, during the pendency of the proceedings, accused Bhawani Shankar expired and the proceedings *qua* him have already been abated.

5. Respondent no. 2 is present. When asked, she apprised that she is 55 years of age.

6. She, candidly, submits that she has amicably resolved her differences with the petitioners and has entered into settlement of her own free will, without any pressure, coercion, or undue influence. She further states that the allegations leveled at the relevant time arose out of misunderstanding, which, in the heat of the moment, led to an unsavoury incident. In view of the settlement, she submits that she does not wish to pursue the proceedings against the petitioners any further.

7. Given the fact that the disputes have been resolved and one other criminal case has also been quashed, continuing with present criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would be a drain on judicial



resources and may rather result in fresh hostility between the parties, defeating the very purpose of the settlement.

8. In the above premise, it is, thus, deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question.

9. Accordingly, the FIR No. 453/2016 dated 24.04.2016, for the offences under Sections 323, 354, 451, 506, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Mukherjee Nagar, along with all consequential proceedings arising there from, including those pending before the Court is, hereby, quashed.

10. Pending application also stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

JANUARY 05, 2026/dr/sa