



2026:DHC:8594



\$~55

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% **Date of Decision: 29th September, 2026**# **CNR No. DLHC010469382026**+ **CRL.M.C. 7321/2026****SUNNY VERMA & ORS.****.....Petitioners**

Through: Mr. Ravi Kumar Saroha with Ms. Priyanka Kumari, Advocates for petitioner nos. 1, 2 and 3 with all petitioners in person.

(M): 9015044427

Email: ravisaroha98@gmail.com

versus**STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.****.....Respondents**

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP for the State.
(M): 9654029294

Email:

advocatekiranbairwa@gmail.com

Ms. Priyanka Yadav with
Mr. Gulshan Kumar, Ms. Vansika Nagpal and Mr. Sagar, Advocates for respondent no. 2.

(M): 9654239297

9811336693

9891333518

Email: pinkyadav88@gmail.com

SI Ajay Kumar, PS Dwarka North.

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



2026:DHC:8594



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. 684/2021*, dated 11th September, 2021, registered at Police Station (“PS”) Dwarka North, Dwarka, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (“IPC”), and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement between the parties.
2. The marriage between petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 got solemnised on 07th July, 2019, and one minor child, namely Master Hayaan, was born out of the said wedlock on 27th May, 2020.
3. The impugned FIR came to be filed on 11th September, 2021, pursuant to a written compliant made by respondent no. 2 to the Crime Against Women (“CAW”) Cell, Dwarka, New Delhi. Subsequently, a Chargesheet dated 25th May, 2022 came to be filed against the petitioners under Sections 498A/406/506/34 of the IPC.
4. A complaint under Section 12 of the Prevention of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (“DV Act”) was filed by respondent no. 2 against the petitioners. Subsequently, a maintenance petition, being *MT Case 528/2021*, under Section 125 of the CrPC and an Execution Petition, being *EX CRL 272/2025*, came to be filed before the Trial Court.
5. During the pendency of the aforementioned proceedings, the parties amicably settled all their disputes and reached a Settlement dated 16th April, 2026, before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Dwarka Courts, Delhi.
6. *Vide* the said Settlement, respondent no. 2 has settled all her disputes



2026:DHC:8594



for a total amount of Rs. 15,50,000/-, which is payable by petitioner no. 1. It has also been agreed that Rs. 07 Lacs shall be paid to respondent no. 2 by petitioner no. 1 at the time of quashing of the impugned FIR.

7. Issue notice.

8. Notice accepted by learned Additional Public Prosecutor (“APP”) for the State as well as learned counsel for respondent no. 2, i.e., the complainant.

9. The parties are present in Court, and are identified by their respective learned counsels.

10. Respondent no. 2 is also identified by the Investigating Officer (“IO”), who is also present before this Court.

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

12. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 have already been granted divorce by way of mutual consent *vide* a decree dated 13th July, 2026, by the Family Court-01, South West, Dwarka, New Delhi.

13. Further, as per the terms of the Settlement dated 16th April, 2026, petitioner no. 1 is required to pay a sum of Rs. 15,50,000/- to respondent no. 2. Out of the aforesaid amount, only a sum of Rs. 07 Lacs remains due and payable to respondent no. 2.

14. A Demand Draft for sum of Rs. 07 Lacs has been handed over to the respondent no. 2, who is present in Court, and is duly accepted.

15. This Court has interacted with respondent no. 2, who submits that she does not wish to pursue the matter any further.

16. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor (“APP”) for the State also submits that she has no objection if the present petition is allowed. However,



she submits that since the custody of the minor child is with respondent no. 2, the rights of the minor child should be protected.

17. In light of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR.

18. Having heard the learned counsels appearing for the parties, this Court notes that the matter has been finally settled between the petitioners and respondent no. 2.

19. In respect of the offences in impugned FIR, this Court notes that the offence under Section 498A of the IPC is non-compoundable.

20. 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.

21. 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 case of 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)

22. This Court notes the fact that the parties have amicably settled their disputes and that petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 are already divorced.

23. Accordingly, considering the submissions made before this Court, the *FIR No. 684/2021*, dated 11th September, 2021, registered at PS Dwarka North, Dwarka, Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC, and all other proceedings emanating therefrom, are quashed. However, it is clarified that the said Settlement between the parties would not affect the rights of the minor child in any manner whatsoever.

24. The present petition is accordingly disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

SEPTEMBER 29, 2026/c