



2026:DHC:8999



\$~9

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% **Date of Decision: 07th October, 2026**# **CNR No. DLHC010370022026**+ **CRL.M.C. 5870/2026, CRL.M.A. 24502/2026 & CRL.M.A. 24503/2026 & CRL.M.A. 24504/2026****RAJIV ALIAS RAJIV KUMAR & ORS.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Raju Atulla, Mr. Irfan Ahmed
and Ms. Harshita Kushwaha, Advs.,
along with petitioners in person
Mob: 8920254901 & 9213856810
Email: atulla121@gmail.com

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Nawal Kishore Jha, APP for the
State

Mob: 9810442918

Email: nawalkishorejha@live.com

Ms. Komal, SI, PS Aman Vihar

Mob: 8930553134

Email: komaldahiya46@gmail.com

Respondent no. 2 in person, along
with counsel (Advocate appearance
not given)

CORAM:**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA****MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (Oral):**

1. The present petition has been filed 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 the
First Information Report ("FIR") being *FIR No. 975/2018* dated 02nd



October, 2018, registered at Police Station (“PS”) Aman Vihar, Outer District, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/354/509/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (“IPC”), along with the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.

2. The aforesaid FIR was initially registered only under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC. Subsequently, the concerned Investigating Officer (“IO”) filed a Chargesheet before the Judicial Magistrate First Class (Mahila Court)-02, North West District, Rohini Courts, Delhi, in *Cr. Case 8207/2021*, including additional charges under Sections 354/506 of the IPC.

3. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned Additional Public Prosecutor (“APP”) appearing for the State, i.e., respondent no. 1, as well as by learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 2.

4. The petitioners and respondent no. 2 are present before this Court, and are duly identified by their respective counsels as well as the IO, who is also present before this Court.

5. The captioned petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of the parties.

6. As per the material on record, the relevant facts for adjudication of the captioned petition are as under:

6.1. The marriage between petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 was solemnized on 29th February, 2002, however, due to temperamental differences and misunderstandings, disputes arose between the parties.

6.2. Subsequently, *FIR No. 975/2018* was registered at the instance of respondent no. 2 against the family members of petitioner no. 1, namely, petitioner no. 2 who is her father-in-law, and petitioner no. 3 who is her brother-in-law.



2026:DHC:8999



6.3. Respondent no. 2 has alleged, *inter alia*, that after she began living with petitioner no. 1 and his family members, they continuously subjected her to harassment, beatings and threats in connection with their demands for dowry.

7. This Court is informed that the petitioners and respondent no. 2 have amicably resolved their dispute by executing a Settlement Agreement dated 16th May, 2026, wherein petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 have agreed to restore their matrimonial relationship and resume cohabitation as husband and wife. Respondent no. 2 has further acknowledged that the allegations in the said FIR arose during a period of matrimonial discord and misunderstanding between the parties, and that, with the intervention of family members and elders, the parties have reconciled their differences.

8. This Court is further informed that petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 have already started living together in terms of their settlement.

9. This Court has also interacted with respondent no. 2 and petitioner no. 1, who confirm the fact that they are now living together and leading a happily married life.

10. Accordingly, respondent no. 2 submits that she does not wish to continue the case any further.

11. Learned APP appearing for the State submits that in view of the settlement between the parties as well as the nature of the case, State has no objection if the present petition is allowed.

12. This Courts notes that the FIR in question contains charges for offences that are non-compoundable in nature. However, the Supreme Court has recognised that 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 involving non-compoundable offences on the basis of a compromise or settlement between the parties, particularly when no overarching public interest is adversely affected by quashing the same.

13. Pertinently, in the case of *Jitendra Raghuvanshi and Others Versus Babita Raghuvanshi and Another*, (2013) 4 SCC 58, the Supreme Court has held that the High Courts are empowered to quash an FIR in cases pertaining to matrimonial disputes in order to foster genuine settlements, even when the offences involved are non-compoundable. The relevant portion of the said judgment reads as under:

“xxx xxx xxx

14. The inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 of the Code are wide and unfettered. In B.S. Joshi [(2003) 4 SCC 675 : 2003 SCC (Cri) 848] , this Court has upheld the powers of the High Court under Section 482 to quash criminal proceedings where dispute is of a private nature and a compromise is entered into between the parties who are willing to settle their differences amicably. We are satisfied that the said decision is directly applicable to the case on hand and the High Court ought to have quashed the criminal proceedings by accepting the settlement arrived at.

15. In our view, it is the duty of the courts to encourage genuine settlements of matrimonial disputes, particularly, when the same are on considerable increase. Even if the offences are non-compoundable, if they relate to matrimonial disputes and the Court is satisfied that the parties have settled the same amicably and without any pressure, we hold that for the purpose of securing ends of justice, Section 320 of the Code would not be a bar to the exercise of power of quashing of FIR, complaint or the subsequent criminal proceedings.

xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)

14. Considering the aforementioned judgment and the submissions made by learned counsels appearing for the parties, this Court finds no



2026:DHC:8999



impediment in allowing the present petition.

15. Accordingly, *FIR No. 975/2018* dated 02nd October, 2018, registered at PS Aman Vihar, Outer District, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/354/509/34 of the IPC, and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

16. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms and, along with the pending applications, stands disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

OCTOBER 7, 2026/SK