



2026:DHC:5823



\$~9

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 22.07.2026

+

CRL.M.C. 1096/2025

IRFAN AHMAD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tarshith Bhardwaj and Mr. Sanat Vadhera, Advocates.
Petitioner in person (*through video conferencing*).

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State with SI Neha Tyagi, PS Shastri Park.
Mr. Rudra Vikram Singh, Mr. Ashirvad Kumar Yadav and Ms. Rashmi, Advocates for R-2 with R-2 in person (*through video conferencing*).

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T (ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks quashing of case FIR No. 179/2024 of PS Shastri Park for offence under Section 498A/406/506/509/377/34 IPC and Section



2026:DHC:5823



3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act on merits.

2. In furtherance of order dated 03.04.2025, respondent no.2 has appeared through videoconferencing and is identified by IO/SI Neha. In response to specific query regarding the allegations levelled in the FIR, the respondent no.2 submits that those allegations are truthful. In view of limited scope of proceedings under Section 482 CrPC, this Court cannot hold that her statement today is false that the FIR allegations are truthful. That has to be tested through trial.

3. It is not just a case of forcible unnatural sexual intercourse allegedly committed against respondent no.2 by the petitioner. It is also the manner in which the unnatural sex was allegedly committed; and that has been described at length by respondent no.2 in the FIR. Not just that, respondent no.2 also alleged in the FIR that the petitioner even video recorded the sexual acts of the first night after their wedding. Further, even in her statement recorded under Section 164 CrPC, the respondent no.2 on oath reaffirmed all those allegations as levelled by her in the FIR.

4. The impugned FIR is not a simple matrimonial dispute FIR. It contains graphic details of the manner in which the unnatural sex was committed forcibly against respondent no.2, who has stated today also that those allegations are truthful. Without testing through full dress trial, those allegations cannot be held false. And it is trite that the High Court shall not invoke inherent jurisdiction to quash FIR on compromise where the offence



2026:DHC:5823



alleged is of serious or heinous nature.

5. In view of the aforesaid, I do not find it a fit case to quash the impugned FIR and proceedings. The petition is dismissed.

GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)

JULY 22, 2026/dr