



2025:DHC:6970



\$~70

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

%

Date of decision: 18.08.2025

+

CRL.M.C.5662/2025

MANPREET SINGH

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Adv. (appearance not given)

Both petitioners are present in person

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR. ... Respondents

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP with SI Gaurav, Cyber Police Station & SI Tej Dutt, PS Hari Nagar R-2 is present in person with Mr. Devesh Sharma, Advocate

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. 617/2020, dated 09.11.2020, registered at P.S Hari Nagar, Delhi under Sections 498A/406/506/34 IPC and all proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of settlement between the parties.



2025:DHC:6970



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 07.05.2006 as per Hindu Rites and ceremonies at Delhi. Two children were born out of the said wedlock. However, on account of temperamental differences Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 are living separately since 06.12.2019.

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. 617/2020 was lodged at instance of Respondent No. 2 at P.S Hari Nagar, Delhi under sections 498A/406/506/34 IPC against the petitioners. Chargesheet has since been filed under sections 498A/406/506/34 IPC and sections 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

4. During the course of proceedings, the parties amicably resolved their disputes and the terms of the compromise were reduced into writing in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding dated 10.11.2022 (attested on 31.05.2023). Pursuant to the aforesaid settlement, marriage between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 was dissolved by a decree of divorce by mutual consent on 16.05.2023. It is submitted that Petitioner No. 1 has paid the total settlement amount of Rs. 15,00,000/- (Rupees Fifteen lacs only) as per the schedule in settlement. It is further submitted that the custody of the minor children would be with respondent no. 2 with no visitation/custody rights to petitioner no. 1 and in furtherance,



2025:DHC:6970



respondent no. 2 and her children shall not claim any right with respect to any movable/immovable property belonging to petitioner no. 1. Copy of the Memorandum of Understanding dated 10.11.2022 has been annexed as Annexure P-3.

5. Parties are physically present before the Court. They have been identified by their respective counsels as well as by the Investigating Officer SI Gaurav from Cyber Police Station and SI Tej Dutt from PS Hari Nagar.

6. Respondent No. 2 confirms that the matter has been amicably settled with the petitioners without any force, fear, coercion and she has no objection if the FIR No. 617/2020 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. 617/2020 is quashed.

8. In ***Rangappa Javoor vs The State Of Karnataka And Another, Diary No. 33313/2019, 2023 LiveLaw (SC) 74***, Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable settlement of matrimonial disputes by observing as under:-

“This court has held that in cases of offences relating to matrimonial disputes, if the Court is satisfied that the parties have genuinely settled the disputes amicably, then for the purpose of securing ends of justice, criminal proceedings inter-se parties can be quashed by exercising the powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India or even under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.”



9. In *Gian Singh vs State of Punjab (2012) 10 SCC 303*, Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes by observing as under:-

"61. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceedings."

10. In *Jitendra Raghuvanshi & Ors. vs Babita Raghuvanshi & Anr., (2013) 4 SCC 58*, Hon'ble Supreme Court has encouraged courts to quash proceedings under section 482 Cr.P.C. in case of settlements in matrimonial disputes to secure the ends of justice, even if offences are non-compoundable by observing as under:-

"15. In our view, it is the duty of the courts to encourage genuine settlements of matrimonial disputes, particularly, when the same are on considerable increase. Even if the offences are non-compoundable, if they relate to matrimonial disputes and the court is satisfied that the parties have settled the same amicably and without any pressure, we hold that for the purpose of securing ends of justice, Section 320 of the Code would not be a bar to the exercise of power of quashing of FIR, complaint or the subsequent criminal proceedings.

16. There has been an outburst of matrimonial disputes in recent times. The institution of marriage occupies an important place and it has an important role to play in the society. Therefore, every effort should be made in the interest of the individuals in order to enable them to settle down in life and live peacefully. If the parties



ponder over their defaults and terminate their disputes amicably by mutual agreement instead of fighting it out in a court of law, in order to do complete justice in the matrimonial matters, the courts should be less hesitant in exercising its extraordinary jurisdiction. It is trite to state that the power under Section 482 should be exercised sparingly and with circumspection only when the court is convinced, on the basis of material on record, that allowing the proceedings to continue would be an abuse of the process of the court or that the ends of justice require that the proceedings ought to be quashed. We also make it clear that exercise of such power would depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case and it has to be exercised in appropriate cases in order to do real and substantial justice for the administration of which alone the courts exist. It is the duty of the courts to encourage genuine settlements of matrimonial disputes and Section 482 of the Code enables the High Court and Article 142 of the Constitution enables this Court to pass such orders.

11. Taking into account the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, this court considers that the parties have entered into an amicable settlement out of their own free will, without any fear, force or coercion and they should be given an opportunity to lead their lives peacefully. No purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR No. 617/2020, dated 09.11.2020, registered at P.S Hari Nagar, Delhi under section 498A/406/506/34 IPC and all the other consequential proceeding emanating therefrom.

12. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 617/2020, dated 09.11.2020, registered at P.S Hari Nagar, Delhi under section 498A/406/506/34 IPC and all the other consequential proceeding emanating therefrom is hereby quashed.



2025:DHC:6970



13. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.
14. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

August 18, 2025
SK

