



\$~55

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% Date of decision: 19.12.2025

+ CRL.M.C. 9095/2025

VICKY & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Pramod Kumar, Mr. Arjun

Singh, Mr. Ajay Kumar Yadav and Ms. Kanti Tiwari, Advs. Petitioner no.1 in person.

Remaining petitioners are

present through vc

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) THROUGH S.H.O. JAITPUR & ANR.

....Respondents

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP

with SI Ved Prakash,

P.S.Jaitpur.

Mr. Pankaj, Adv. for R-2.

R-2 in person.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA <u>JUDGMENT(ORAL)</u>

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J.

1. This is a petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, seeking quashing of FIR No. 497/2023, dated 20.11.2023, registered at P.S Jaitpur, Delhi under Sections

CRL.M.C. 9095/2025 Page 1 of 4





498A/406/34 IPC 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 20.01.2022 as per Hindu Rites and ceremonies. One child was born out of the said wedlock. Due to temperamental differences Petitioner no. 1 and Respondent no. 2 have been living separately since 20.04.2023.
- 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. 497/2023 was lodged at the instance of respondent no. 2 under sections 498A/406/34 IPC against the petitioners.
- 4. During the pendency of proceedings, the parties amicably resolved their disputes before and the terms of the compromise were reduced into writing in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding dated 05.10.2025. It is submitted that petitioner no. 1 and respondent no. 2 have resumed cohabitation along their child w.e.f. 15.10.2025. Copy of the Memorandum of Understanding dated 05.10.2025 has been annexed as Annexure P-2.
- 5. Petitioner No. 1 and respondent no. 2 are physically present before the Court while remaining petitioners have entered their

CRL.M.C. 9095/2025 Page 2 of 4





appearance through VC. They have been identified by their respective counsels as well as by the Investigating Officer SI Ved Prakash from PS Jaitpur.

- 6. Respondent no. 2 confirms that the matter has been amicably settled with the petitioner without any force, fear, coercion and she has resumed cohabitation with petitioner no. 1 along their child and has no objection if the FIR No. 497/2023 is quashed against the Petitioner.
- 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. 497/2023 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

CRL.M.C. 9095/2025 Page 3 of 4





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. The petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 497/2023, dated 20.11.2023, registered at P.S Jaitpur, Delhi under section 498A/406/34 IPC 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 19, 2025/ib *SK*

CRL.M.C. 9095/2025 Page 4 of 4