



\$~14

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

% ***Date of Decision: 07th May, 2026***

+ CRL.M.C. 1340/2026 & CRL.M.A. 5363/2026 & CRL.M.A.
5364/2026 & CRL.M.A. 5365/2026
ANKIT KUMAR YADAVPetitioner

Through: Mr. K.S. Sharma, Advocate with
Petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP
W/SI Surabhi, PS-Amar Colony.
Advocate for Respondent Nos.2-3
(Appearance not given).
Respondent Nos.2-3 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioner herein seek quashing of FIR No. 235/2024 dated 03.08.2024, registered at Police Station Amar Colony, for commission of offences under Sections 376 IPC & 6 POCSO Act, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. The abovesaid FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint made by prosecutrix, who was studying in class 12th at the relevant time, and she claimed that petitioner, had, earlier, inappropriately touched her and, thereafter, made forcible physical relation with her. It was only when she became pregnant because of such physical relationship and taken to the hospital, she, eventually, revealed about the abovesaid fact, which resulted in



the registration of the abovesaid FIR.

3. Charge-sheet was filed for commission of offences u/s 6 POCSO Act and 376 IPC and charges were also framed under those sections and the case is at the stage of trial.

4. The prosecutrix has already entered into the witness box and her testimony indicates that she is not firm in her stand.

5. In her examination, she did not utter a single word against the accused and, therefore, she was cross-examined by the prosecution with the permission of the court. In such cross-examination, though she deposed against the accused but, when she was further cross-examined by the defence, she took somersault and claimed that there was no forcible sexual intercourse. She claimed that she knew the accused prior to the incident and they were in love with each-other and that she wanted to marry him. Prosecutrix even deposed that she was not aware of the contents of her complaint and that her signatures were obtained on a blank paper.

6. Since she had come with contradictory answers, she was re-examined and in her such re-examination she claimed that her second version i.e. the fact that no wrong had been committed by the accused, was the correct version and claimed that earlier she could not understand the questions and, therefore, she gave wrong answers, out of fear. She however, admitted that there was physical relation between her and the accused, but, it was with her consent.

7. When the above said matter was taken up by the learned Trial Court on 13.05.2025, the applicant had prayed for bail and there was no objection to the grant of bail and the victim and her mother were present before the court and, after recording their '*no objection*', and keeping in mind the overall facts of



the case, and the fact that she wanted to get married to the accused, the learned trial court granted bail to the accused.

8. As per the settlement deed placed on record, they both have already decided to marry each other and, therefore, prosecutrix is no longer interested in pursuing the abovesaid FIR.

9. It is submitted that the prosecutrix, who has already attained the age of majority, and is also present in court with her parents, IO is also present and she duly identifies them.

10. The parties have been called inside chamber for interaction for according due satisfactions about her stand in the present matter.

11. The prosecutrix is firm in her decision and submits that she has entered into the abovesaid settlement out of her own free will, without any coercion and influence from any corner whatsoever and therefore, she would have '*no objection*' if FIR in question is quashed. She contends that since she already attained the age of majority, she is entitled to take her own decisions. She submits that even her parents are now willing for the abovesaid marriage and, therefore, in order to ensure that their family life runs smoothly and there is no hanging sword over their heads, she prays that the above said FIR be quashed. Respondent No.2 reiterates that she has voluntarily decided to marry the petitioner. She seeks quashing and termination of proceedings, for the reason that the continuance and pendency of present criminal proceedings is creating inexorable apprehension and trauma in their minds and, therefore, its closure would bring complete peace, harmony and justice.

12. In view of the above, since the present case is of the year 2024 with very bleak chance of it resulting in conviction coupled with the fact that respondent No.2 and petitioner have decided to tie knot, continuing with



further proceedings would serve no meaningful purpose and would only disrupt their future family-life. Reference in this regard be also made to *Mohd. Parwej v. State*, 2026 SCC OnLine Del 1030, *Harmeet Singh v. State (NCT of Delhi)*, 2026 SCC OnLine Del 1707.

13. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, it is deemed appropriate to quash the instant FIR.

14. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No. 235/2024 dated 03.08.2024, registered at Police Station Amar Colony, for commission of offences under Sections 376 IPC & 6 POCSO Act, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, stands quashed.

15. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

16. Pending applications also stand disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MAY 7, 2026/jk/pb