



\$~48

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 39/2026**

SH SURENDRA KUMAR JANGID & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Vaibhav Bhardwaj with Ms. Shweta and Mr. Gaurav Kumar, Advocates.

P-1 in court and P-2 to 6 via video-conferencing.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel (Crl) for the State with Ms. Priyan Agarwal, Mr. Abhinav Arya, Mr. Aryan Sachdeva, Advocates and SI Keshav Dalal, P.S.: K. Khas.

Ms. Sangeeta Singh, Advocate for R2 with R-2 in court.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

% **07.01.2026**

CRL.M.A. 359/2026 & CRL.M.A. 360/2026

Exemptions granted, subject to just exceptions.

Let requisite compliances be made within 01 week.

The applications stand disposed-of.

W.P.(CRL) 39/2026

By way of the present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioners, who are the former husband and in-laws of the complainant/respondent No. 2, seek quashing of case FIR No. 894/2021 dated 30.12.2021 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') and section 4 of



the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 at P.S.: Khajuri Khas, North-East Delhi.

2. The petition is premised on Settlement Agreement dated 16.12.2022 arrived at through mediation before the Counselling Cell, Family Courts, North-East District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi; and Divorce Decree dated 26.10.2023, which is the culmination of petitions under sections 13B(1) and 13B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act 1955, whereby the parties had sought dissolution of their marriage by mutual consent.
3. The petition is supported by affidavits of the petitioners, as also of respondent No. 2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
4. Petitioner No.1 as well as respondent No. 2 are present in court and petitioners Nos. 2 to 6 have joined *via* video-conferencing. Their credentials have been verified and they have also been identified by their respective counsel.
5. The parties have confirmed that no child was born from the wed-lock.
6. No appeal is stated to have been filed from the divorce decree.
7. The court has queried Ms. Kajal Sharma, respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that a settlement has been entered into between the parties; and that in full-and-final settlement of all her claims including towards maintenance (past, present and future), *stridhan*, dowry articles, jewellery, permanent alimony, etc., she was to receive a sum of Rs. 2,60,000/- from petitioner No. 1; out of which Rs. 1,60,000/- was paid earlier and Rs.1,00,000/- has been paid in court today, in compliance of the terms of the settlement agreement. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.



8. Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
9. In the circumstances, in line with the law laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab &Anr.*** reported as (2012) 10 SCC 303 as also in ***Narinder Singh &Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2014) 6 SCC 466, this court sees no reason why the subject FIR and all proceedings emanating therefrom should not be quashed. This court is of the view that in light of the settlement between the contesting parties, continuing with the subject FIR and all subsequent proceedings would be an exercise in futility and would not be conducive to peace and harmony between the parties.
10. Accordingly, case FIR No. 894/2021 dated 30.12.2021 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 IPC and section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 at P.S.: Khajuri Khas, North-East Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
11. Petition stands disposed-of.
12. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

JANUARY 7, 2026

ds