



\$~62

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Decision: 03rd September, 2026

CNR No. DLHC010328532024

+ **CRL.M.C. 4427/2024 & CRL.M.A. 16798/2024**

DEEP SINGH RAWAT AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Nusrat Hassan with Ms. Vartika Tyagi and Mr. Manish Kumar Singh, Advocates with Petitioner Nos.1 and 4 in person and Petitioner Nos.2 and 3 through V.C.

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP for the State with SI Ashok Singh Chauhan, PS Nihal Vihar.
Mr. Varun Kashyap, Advocate for respondent No.2 with respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of FIR No.240/2017 dated 15.05.2017, registered at Police Station Nihal Vihar, for commission of offences under Sections 323/341/506/34 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

2. As per the case of prosecution, respondent No.2 was in love with petitioner No.1 herein and they got married to each other on 10.03.2016. However, thereafter, she suspected and apprehended that her husband was already married and when she confronted him in this regard, he threatened her and assaulted her. She also made allegations against the other relatives of



her husband and on the basis of her report, FIR was registered for committing offences under Sections 323/341/506/34 IPC. However, during investigation, when her statement was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., she made further allegations against her husband claiming that she was sexually assaulted by him and that he had also committed unnatural sex with her. This resulted in addition of aggravated penal sections under Sections 376/377/494 IPC.

3. Quashing is being sought for the reason that the matter has now been amicably settled and respondent No.2 is no longer interested in pursuing the abovesaid FIR.

4. When the present matter was taken up by the learned predecessor Bench on 28.10.2024, the complainant had appeared before this Court and had reiterated that she did not want to pursue any proceedings arising out of the abovesaid FIR and, resultantly, learned Trial Court was directed not to proceed further with the matter. Such interim order continues to be in operation.

5. Respondent No. 2 is present in person and she has been duly identified by her counsel as well as by Investigating Officer.

6. When asked, she reiterated the terms of settlement, as recorded in Settlement Deed dated 13.05.2024. She submits that she has already moved on in her life and has got lawfully married two years back. She also submits that she has a child from such marriage and since she has already accepted the apology of the petitioners, she is no longer interested in pursuing with the abovesaid FIR and would have *no objection* if the FIR in question is quashed. She also submits that as per the settlement, she is giving up her any right, title or interest in any of the movable properties of the petitioners and they have agreed to part ways in a graceful manner. She also submits that she had filed a



petition seeking maintenance and had also filed an Execution Petition. However, in view of the settlement, these petitions have already been withdrawn. She asserts that she has entered into the abovesaid settlement out of her own free will, without any coercion and influence from any corner whatsoever.

7. Learned Addl. P.P. for the State submits that allegations made by her in statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. are somewhat serious in nature and, therefore, learned Trial Court should be asked to continue with the trial.

8. The abovesaid FIR is of the year 2017. Respondent No.2 has now remarried and has moved on in her life.

9. In *Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*: (2014) 6 SCC 466, the Apex Court observed that proceedings, even in non-compoundable cases, can be quashed on the basis of settlement provided that the Court is satisfied that there was no meaningful purpose in continuing with the proceedings, and that the scope of conviction was remote and bleak. Reference be made to *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.*: (2012) 10 SCC 303.

10. It will also be useful to make reference to one recent pronouncement of the Apex Court i.e. *Madhukar & Anr. vs. State of Maharashtra* 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1415. The abovesaid case also relates to offence under Section 376 IPC and, when an application was moved by the parties seeking quashing of the proceedings on the basis of settlement, such petition was dismissed by the jurisdictional High Court which compelled the parties to approach Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Apex Court observed as under in para 6:-

“6. At the outset, we recognise that the offence under Section 376 IPC is undoubtedly of a grave and heinous nature. Ordinarily, quashing of proceedings involving such offences on the ground of settlement between



the parties is discouraged and should not be permitted lightly. However, the power of the Court under Section 482 CrPC to secure the ends of justice is not constrained by a rigid formula and must be exercised with reference to the facts of each case.”

11. Resultantly, in the abovesaid case, while taking note of the submission of the victim wherein she had submitted that she had settled in her personal life and continuing with the criminal proceedings would only disturb her peace and stability, finding complete consistency in her such stance, and noticing the fact that the continuation of the trial would not serve any meaningful purpose and would rather prolong distress for all concerned, especially the complainant, and the burden of the Courts, without the likelihood of a productive outcome, the appeals were allowed and the criminal proceedings were quashed.

12. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, continuing with criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose, When even the complainant does not wish to press any charges against the petitioners.

13. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023*, it is deemed appropriate to quash the instant FIR.

14. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No.240/2017 dated 15.05.2017, registered at Police Station Nihal Vihar, for commission of offences under Sections 323/341/506/34 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is, hereby, quashed. Original affidavits and MoU of the parties, copies of which have been placed on record in the present proceedings, shall be submitted before the learned Trial Court within four weeks from today, so that these become part of Trial Court Record.



15. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.
16. Pending application also stands disposed of.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 3, 2026/st/sk