



2026:DHC:9000



\$~13

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% **Date of Decision: 07th October, 2026**# **CNR No. DLHC010461352026**+ **W.P.(CRL) 3010/2026 & CRL.M.A. 30097/2026****PUNEET BANSAL AND ORS.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Praveen Kumar, Adv.
Mob: 8448057235

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for the
State
Mr. Hemant Kumar, SI, PS Jafraabad,
Delhi
Mob: 8010866094
Mr. Yogesh Kumar, Adv. for R-2,
along with R-2 in person
Mob: 9599533417
Email:
advocateyogeshkumar942@gmail.com**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA****MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (Oral):**

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950 ("Constitution"), read with 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. 518/2023*



2026:DHC:9000



dated 09th October, 2023, registered at Police Station (“PS”) Jafrabad, North East District, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/506/323/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (“IPC”), and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 (“DP Act”), on the ground of settlement.

2. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by Learned Additional Standing Counsel (“ASC”) appearing for the State, i.e., respondent no. 1, as well as by learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 2.

3. The petitioners and respondent no. 2 are present before this Court, and are duly identified by their respective counsels as well as the Investigating Officer (“IO”), who is also present before this Court.

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

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

5.1. The marriage between petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 was solemnized on 14th May, 2019, however, due to temperamental differences, they started living separately from 10th January, 2020.

5.2. *FIR No. 839/2021* came to be 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 mother-in-law.

5.3. Respondent no. 2 has alleged, *inter alia*, that petitioner no. 1 subjected her to physical assault and abuse on multiple occasions after she began residing with him.

5.4. She has further alleged that petitioners nos. 2 and 3, acting in criminal conspiracy with petitioner no. 1, subjected her to physical assault, intimidation, and abuse, in connection with demands for dowry.



2026:DHC:9000



5.5. Despite efforts by respondent no. 2 and her parents to reconcile with the petitioners, they failed to provide any satisfactory response, which led to complaint in the present case and the resultant FIR.

6. This Court is informed that the petitioners and respondent no. 2 have already settled their disputes by executing a Settlement Agreement dated 04th November, 2025, before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi, wherein petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 have agreed to dissolve their marriage by mutual consent.

7. Further, in terms of the Settlement Agreement, petitioner no. 1 agreed to pay a total amount of Rs. 7,00,000/- to respondent no. 2 towards full and final settlement of her claims for maintenance, permanent alimony and jewellery, as per the following payment schedule:

- (i) Rs. 2,30,000/- at the time of recording the statement of the parties for the first motion petition for divorce;
- (ii) Rs. 2,30,000/- at the time of recording the statement of the parties for the second motion petition for divorce;
- (iii) Rs. 2,40,000/- at the time of quashing of *FIR No. 518/2023* before this Court.

8. It is submitted that out of the aforesaid amount, a sum of Rs. 4,60,000/- already stands paid to respondent no. 2.

9. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that he is carrying a Demand Draft for the balance amount of Rs. 2,40,000/- today.

10. The said Demand Draft has been duly handed over to respondent no. 2 before this Court, and the same has been accepted by her.

11. Upon interaction with respondent no. 2, she submits that she has no objection if the present petition is allowed.



2026:DHC:9000



12. This Court is also apprised that the marriage between petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 already stands dissolved, as they have obtained a decree of divorce by mutual consent dated 19th March, 2026, passed by the Principal Judge, Family Court, Shahdara, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi, in *HMA 520/2026*.

13. It is also submitted that respondent no. 2 has withdrawn her complaint in *Ct Cases 908/2021*, filed under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (“PWDV Act”), as recorded in the order dated 31st July, 2026, passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class (Mahila Court)-03, Shahdara, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

14. In light of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the FIR in question.

15. Learned ASC appearing for the State submits that in view of the nature of the dispute and the settlement between the parties, the State has no serious objections to the present petition.

16. However, he has expressed concern that the petition has lingered for a long time.

17. Having heard learned counsels appearing for the parties, this Court notes that the parties have arrived at a settlement in respect of the present matter.

18. The Supreme Court has held that under Section 528 of the BNSS, High Courts may quash criminal proceedings, even with respect to non-compoundable offences, if the concerned parties have arrived at a compromise or settlement, and particularly when no overarching public interest is adversely affected by quashing the same.

19. In *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 in nature. 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)

20. Accordingly, considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, *FIR No. 518/2023* dated 09th October, 2023, registered at PS Jafrabad, North East District, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/506/323/34 of the IPC and Section 4 of the DP Act, and all proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.



2026:DHC:9000



21. The present petition, along with the pending application, is accordingly disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

OCTOBER 7, 2026/SK