



2025:DHC:7082



\$~81

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

% Date of decision: 20.08.2025

+ W.P. (CRL) 2599/2025 & CRL. M.A. 24513/2025
NECESSARY ORDERS AND DIRECTIONS, CRL.M.A.
24514/2025 EXEMPTION FROM FILING CERTIFIED
COPIES ETC.

SH. NITIN SHARMA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Mr. Bakul
Jain, Mr. Shivam Bansal, Advs.
with P-1, 3, 5 in person. P-4
through VC.

Versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing
Counsel with Ms. Priyam
Aggarwal, Mr. Abhinav Kumar
Arya, Mr. Aryan Sachdeva,
Advs. with SI Kishan Chand,
PS Dwarka South.
Mr. Ranbir Singh, Adv. for R-2
along with R-2 in person.**CORAM:-****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA****JUDGMENT(ORAL)****RAVINDER DUDEJA, J.**

1. This is a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, seeking quashing of FIR No. 131/2025, dated 12.03.2025, registered at P.S Dwarka, Delhi under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC and all proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of settlement between the parties.



2025:DHC:7082



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 16.02.2022 as per Hindu Rites and ceremonies at Delhi. No 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 14.12.2022.

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. 131/2025 was lodged at instance of Respondent No. 2 at P.S Dwarka, Delhi under sections 498A/406/34 IPC against the petitioners. It is submitted that since after recording of statement of Respondent no. 2 under Section 164 Cr.P.C, Section 377 IPC has also been invoked.

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 26.07.2025. Pursuant to the aforesaid settlement, the 1st motion for divorce between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 has been granted on 06.08.2025. It is submitted that Petitioner No. 1 has paid Rs. 50,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty Lacs only) out of the total settlement amount of Rs. 58,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty Eight lacs only) as per the schedule in settlement. Copy of the Memorandum of Understanding dated 26.07.2025 has been annexed as Annexure-B.



2025:DHC:7082



5. Petitioner no. 1, 3, 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 Kishan Chand from PS Dwarka South.

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. 131/2025 is quashed against the Petitioners. Petitioner no. 1 undertakes to pay balance amount of Rs. 8,00,000/- on or before the 2nd motion.

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. 131/2025 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



2025:DHC:7082



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 vs. State of Haryana, (2003) 4 SCC 675*.

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

11. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 131/2025, dated 12.03.2025, registered at P.S Dwarka, Delhi under sections 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

August 20, 2025

SK