



\$~18

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% ***Date of Decision: 06th January, 2026***

+ CRL.M.C. 87/2026

NEHA PATHANIA AND ANR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikram Pradeep, Ms. Neha Rajpal
and Mr. Anay Khandelwal, Advocates
along with P-1 in person

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) AND ANR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP
Mr. Amrita Sharma and Ms. Easha
Chandhok, Advocates for R-2
R-2 in person (Through VC)
ACP Bharat Ram and SI Bachchu
Ram, Vigilance

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 528, Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking quashing of FIR No. 89/2025 Police Station C.R. Park, New Delhi
2. Petitioner No. 1 got married to one Mr. Karan Raj Sharma (son of respondent no. 2 herein) on 02.06.2013. However, owing to matrimonial misunderstanding and temperamental differences, multiple litigations were initiated by both the sides which included one complaint under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 filed by petitioner and also one complaint (Diary No. 154-LC-R/SHO C.R. Park) lodged by her with the police, which is still pending investigation.
3. Husband of petitioner no. 1 also filed suit for declaration of title and recovery of possession and one other suit for injunction.



4. Fact remains that present FIR No. 89/2025 was registered on the basis of complaint lodged by mother-in-law of petitioner no. 1 and as per crux of allegations made by her, her daughter-in-law, accompanied by her sister, criminally intimidated her and used casteist remarks which resulted into registration of aforesaid FIR on 25.04.2025.

5. Charge-sheet has already been filed against petitioner no. 1 and petitioner no. 2 (sister of petitioner no. 1) and charges are yet to be ascertained.

6. Dispute was, essentially, matrimonial in nature and all concerned have settled such disputes amicably and settlement deed dated 18.09.2025 is signed by petitioner no. 1, her husband and her mother-in-law. It is apprised that as per terms of settlement, suit filed for declaration of title and recovery of possession has already been decreed in favour of husband of petitioner no. 1. Such decree is also based on settlement between the parties.

7. Parties i.e. petitioner no. 1 and her husband have also agreed to obtain divorce by way of mutual consent and it is also jointly apprised that statements with respect to First Motion have already been recorded by the learned Judge, Family Court on 23.09.2025.

8. Complainant i.e. mother-in-law of petitioner no. 1 has joined the proceedings through *videoconferencing* and, when asked, she submitted that she has entered into the settlement on 18.09.2025. She also reiterates that such settlement is without coercion, pressure or undue influence and is completely voluntary in nature. She submits that she has resolved her disputes with petitioners and is no longer desirous in pursuing legal proceedings against the petitioners and, therefore, has no objection if the aforesaid FIR is quashed.



9. Learned counsel for both the parties submit that parties would adhere to the terms of settlement and would take appropriate steps in terms thereof. As per settlement deed, petitioner no. 1 and her husband have agreed to dissolve their marriage by way of mutual consent and petitioner no. 1 has agreed to accept a consolidated settlement amount of Rs. 1.30 crores to be paid in four installments in lieu of her jewellery, *istridhan*, maintenance (past, present and future) and permanent alimony.

10. There is no child from the wedlock in question.

11. Petitioner no. 1 is present in Court and reiterates the terms of settlement as recorded in the aforesaid settlement. She also undertakes to adhere to the terms and conditions as mentioned in the settlement deed. She also submits that she has already received two installments and prays that since her mother-in-law is not interested in pursuing with the complaint in question, FIR may be quashed. She also undertakes not to pursue criminal complaint filed by her.

12. In the above premise, it is, thus, deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question.

13. Accordingly, FIR No. 89/2025 registered at Police Station C.R. Park, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is, hereby, quashed.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

JANUARY 06, 2026/dr/pb