



2025:DHC:11120



\$~84

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of decision: 10.12.2025

+ CRL.M.C. 8819/2025 & CRL.M.A. 36771/2025 EXEMPTION
FROM FILING CERTIFIED COPY

ZUBER ALI ALIAS MOHD ZUBER & ORS.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, Mr. Anshul
Goyal, Advs. with P-1 to 3 and
P-5 in person. P-4 through VC.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP with SI
Sudhanshu, PS Seelampur.
Mr. Irshad Parveen, Adv. for R-
2 with R-2 in person.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

JUDGMENT(ORAL)**RAVINDER DUDEJA, J.**

1. This is a petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, seeking quashing of FIR No. 0538/2018, dated 31.12.2018, registered at P.S Seelampur, Delhi under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC & 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act and all proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of settlement between the parties.

2. The factual matrix giving rise to the instant case is that the marriage between Petitioner No.1 and Respondent no. 2/complainant



was solemnized on 17.09.2016 as per Muslim Rites and ceremonies. One child was born out of the said wedlock. However, on account of temperamental differences Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 are living separately since 20.10.2017

3. As per averments made in the FIR, Respondent No. 2 was subjected to physical and mental harassment on account of dowry demands by the petitioners. FIR No. 0538/2018 was lodged at the instance of respondent no. 2 at PS Seelampur under sections 498A/406/34 IPC & 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act against the petitioners.

4. During the course of proceedings, the parties amicably resolved their disputes before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Courts, New Delhi and the terms of settlement were written in the form of Settlement dated 19.08.2025. Thereafter the parties entered into a settlement deed/Divorce deed dated 04.11.2025 and the petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 have obtained divorce by mutual consent as per Talaq-e-hasan where in the first divorce was given on 11.06.2025, the second divorce on 13.07.2025 and the final divorce on 10.08.2025. It is submitted that the petitioner no. 1 has paid the entire settlement amount of Rs. 1,50,000/- (Rupees One Lac Fifty Thousand Only) to respondent no. 2. It is further submitted that the custody of the minor child shall remain with the respondent no. 2 and petitioner no. 1 shall not claim custody or visitation rights as per the schedule in



the settlement. Copy of the settlement agreement dated 19.08.2025 and deed dated 04.11.2025 has been annexed as Annexure P-2 & P-3.

5. Petitioners no. 1 to 3, Petitioner no. 5 and respondent no. 2 are physically present before the Court while petitioner no. 4 has entered her appearance through VC. They have been identified by their respective counsels as well as by the Investigating Officer SI Sudhanshu, from PS Seelampur.

6. Respondent No. 2 confirms that the matter has been amicably settled with the petitioners without any force, fear, coercion and she has received the entire settlement and has no objection if the FIR No. 0538/2018 is quashed against the Petitioners.

7. In view of the settlement between the parties, learned Additional PP appearing for the State, also has no objection if the present FIR No. 0538/2018 is quashed.

8. Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable settlement of disputes in *Rangappa Javoor vs The State Of Karnataka And Another*, Diary No. 33313/2019, 2023 LiveLaw (SC) 74, *Jitendra Raghuvanshi & Ors. vs Babita Raghuvanshi & Anr.*, (2013) 4 SCC 58 & in *Gian Singh vs State of Punjab* (2012) 10 SCC 303.

9. Further, it is settled that the inherent powers under section 482 of the Code are required to be exercised to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process of any court. Further, the High Court



can quash non-compoundable offences after considering the nature of the offence and the amicable settlement between the concerned parties. Supreme Court and this Court have repeatedly held that the cases arising out of matrimonial differences should be put to a quietus if the parties have reached an amicable settlement. Reliance may be placed upon *B.S. Joshi v. State of Haryana, (2003) 4 SCC*.

10. In view of the above facts that the parties have amicably resolved their differences out of their own free will and without any coercion, it would be in the interest of justice, to quash the abovementioned FIR and the proceedings pursuant thereto.

11. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 0538/2018, dated 31.12.2018, registered at P.S Seelampur, Delhi under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC & 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act and all the other consequential proceeding emanating therefrom is hereby quashed.

12. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

13. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

December 10, 2025

MA