



2026:DHC:1534



\$~50

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% *Date of Decision: 19th February, 2026*

+ CRL.M.C. 1411/2026

AMANDEEP SINGH BAJAJ & ANR.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kshitiz Aggarwal, Advocate
along with petitioners on person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondent

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, APP with SI Ashish
Yadav.

Mr. Divyansh Verma, Advocates
along with respondent No.2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of FIR No. 166/2017 dated 24.12.2017, registered at Police Station Gulabi Bagh, for commission of offences under Sections 498-A/406/34 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. The marriage between the petitioner No.1 and Respondent No.2 was solemnized on 25.11.2012, according to Sikh rites and ceremonies. They were blessed with a baby girl from the abovesaid wedlock on 28.09.2015.
3. However, on account of some matrimonial dispute, respondent No.2 reported the matter to police which resulted in registration of abovesaid FIR.
4. Both the sides have entered into settlement and have started living together in complete harmony and, therefore, the present petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR.
5. Copy of the charge-sheet has been filed in which three persons i.e.



2026:DHC:1534



Amandeep Singh Bajaj (husband), Ms. Vijaya Bajaj (mother-in-law), Mr. Gurubachan Singh (father-in-law, since deceased) have been shown in column No.11. Two accused i.e. Reena Bhardwaj and Dimpy Makkar have been shown in column No. 12, and as per the charge-sheet, there is no sufficient evidence against them.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner as well as the learned counsel for the respondent No.2 submits that the Court has not even taken cognizance against said two persons, whose names appear in column No. 12.

7. Charges have yet not been ascertained.

8. It is also apprised that Father-in-law of respondent No.2 had expired during the pendency of the proceedings and such fact has also been duly verified by the IO. The proceedings *qua* him have already been ordered to be *abated* by the learned Trial Court.

9. Respondent No.2, who is present in Court, submits that she has entered into settlement voluntarily and without any force and coercion and is residing happily with husband.

10. She reiterates the terms of settlement and submits that she does not want any further action and would have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed.

11. Her affidavit, to said effect, is also on record.

12. The Investigating Officer (I.O.) is present and duly identifies her.

13. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, continuing with criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose, especially, when dispute does not involve any public interest and is, primarily, private in nature. In any case, even the complainant does not wish to press any charges against the petitioners.



2026:DHC:1534



14. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS, it is deemed appropriate to quash the instant FIR.

15. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No. 166/2017 dated 24.12.2017, registered at Police Station Gulabi Bagh, for commission of offences under Sections 498-A/406/34 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, is hereby, quashed.

16. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 19, 2026/sw/pb