



2025:DHC:7144



\$~55

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
% *Date of Decision: 21.08.2025*  
+ **CRL.M.C. 5685/2025**

ASIF MIRZA AND ORS .....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Kuldeep Kumar, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR .....Respondents  
Through: Mr. Nawal Kishore Jha, APP for State  
with SI Bharti.

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

**J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. Petitioners seek quashing of case FIR No. 60/2023 of PS Aman Vihar for offence under Section 376/506/34 IPC on the ground that complainant *de facto* (respondent no.2) has compromised the disputes with the petitioners.
2. Respondent no.2, present in court is identified by IO/SI Bharti. Respondent no.2 accepts notice. Learned APP accepts notice.
3. Keeping in mind the heinous offence alleged by the complainant *de facto* against two persons, stated to be her brother-in-law and father-in-law, who allegedly raped her multiple times, a query was raised to counsel for petitioners as to why such heinous charges be quashed. In response, learned



2025:DHC:7144



counsel for petitioners stated that these charges were falsely levelled because respondent no.2 is embroiled in matrimonial dispute (*though not litigation*) with her husband. That being so, the respondent no.2 was asked as to whether the allegations in the subject FIR are truthful or not, but she was evasive. Keeping in mind the consequences of her answer, she was asked as to whether she has engaged any counsel so that in the presence of her counsel she may be asked the aforesaid. The respondent no.2 stated that the counsel appearing today on behalf of petitioners is her counsel. But counsel for petitioners denies this. As such, there is no clarity.

4. But the fact remains that the allegations levelled in the impugned FIR are of extremely serious nature. It is not just that respondent no.2 was allegedly raped by her brother-in-law and father-in-law, the allegations are also to the effect that father-in-law of respondent no.2 clicked her video while she was bathing and threatened to circulate the same.

5. Keeping in mind the nature of allegations as described above, I am not satisfied that it would be in the interest of justice to quash the subject FIR. Therefore, the petition is dismissed.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**AUGUST 21, 2025/ry**