



\$~62

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% Date of decision: 10.09.2025

+ CRL.M.C. 6402/2025 & CRL.M.A. 27023/2025EXEMPTION

SH BRIJESH KUMAR ANAND

....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vipul Srivastava & Mr.

Rajindra Vats, Advs. Petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

....Respondents

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP for the

State with ASI Umesh Chand,

PS KNK Marg.

Mr. Nitish Sharma, 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. 183/2023, dated 18.05.2023, registered at P.S K.N.Katju Marg, Delhi under Sections 498A/406 IPC and all proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of settlement between the parties.

CRL.M.C. 6402/2025 Page 1 of 4





- 2. The factual matrix giving rise to the instant case is that the marriage between Petitioner and Respondent no. 2/complainant was solemnized on 29.04.2007 as per Hindu Rites and ceremonies at New Delhi. Two children were born out of the said wedlock. However, on account of temperamental differences Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 are living separately since March 2020.
- 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 petitioner. FIR No. 183/2023 was lodged at instance of Respondent no. 2 under sections 498A/406 IPC against the petitioner.
- 4. During the course of proceedings, the parties amicably resolved their disputes before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Rohini Courts and the terms of the compromise were reduced into writing in the form of a Mediation Settlement dated 15.05.2024 and Memorandum of Understanding dated 24.03.2025. In view of the aforesaid settlement dated 15.05.2024, petitioner and respondent no. 2 have obtained divorce on 06.06.2024. It is submitted that petitioner has paid the entire settlement amount of Rs. 20,00,000/- (Rupees Twenty Lacs only) as per the schedule in the settlement along with ownership of properties as mentioned in the settlement to respondent no. 2. It is further submitted that petitioner has also provided 2 Demand Drafts of Rs. 67,50,000/- each (Rupees Sixty Seven Lacs and Fifty Thousand only) in favour of the children, for the purpose of FDRs and

CRL.M.C. 6402/2025 Page 2 of 4





respondent no. 2 shall have the custody of the children. Copy of the Mediation Settlement dated 15.05.2024 and Memorandum of Understanding dated 24.03.2025 has been annexed as Annexure P-2 & P-5.

- 5. Parties are physically present before the Court. They have been identified by their respective counsels as well as by the Investigating Officer ASI Umesh Chand from PS KNK Marg
- 6. Respondent No. 2 confirms that the matter has been amicably settled with the petitioner without any force, fear, coercion and she has received the entire settlement amount along with the ownership of properties and demand drafts in favour of the children and has no objection if the FIR No. 183/2023 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. 183/2023 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

CRL.M.C. 6402/2025 Page 3 of 4





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. Hence, 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. 183/2023, dated 18.05.2023, registered at P.S K.N.Katju Marg, Delhi under section 498A/406 IPC and all the other consequential proceeding emanating therefrom is hereby quashed.

भारपमेच जयह

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

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

September 10, 2025 *SK*

CRL.M.C. 6402/2025 Page 4 of 4