



\$~111

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 663/2026**

AMIT SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Samit Khosla, Advocate with
Petitioner in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for
State with SI Rekha Chauhan, PS
Pandav Nagar.

Mr. Nitesh Anan and Mr. Sagar
Yadav, Advocate for R2 with R2
in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **27.01.2026**

CRL.M.A. 2615/2026 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 663/2026

1. By way of this petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 [corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973], the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No. 278/2024 dated 06.06.2024, lodged at Police Station Pandav Nagar, District East, New Delhi, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, on the ground of settlement.
2. The impugned FIR arises out of a matrimonial relationship



between petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 – complainant. Both petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 are present in Court. They are identified by their counsel as well as by the Investigating Officer [“IO”]. The other petitioners [i.e., petitioner Nos. 2 to 8], who are the family members of petitioner No. 1, are present through video conference. They are identified by their learned counsel and the IO.

3. Mr. Nitesh Anan, learned counsel for respondent No. 2, states that, in view of the settlement between the parties, respondent No. 2 does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further.

4. I am informed that, in the proceedings before the Sessions Court, petitioner No. 1 has been kept in column 12 of the chargesheet, and a closure report has been filed against all the other petitioners. Respondent No. 2 has not filed a protest petition and has stated before the Sessions Court that the matter has been settled.

5. Having regard to the above submissions, the presence of petitioner Nos. 2 to 8 is dispensed with for the present.

6. I am also informed that petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 have filed proceedings before the Family Court for divorce by mutual consent [HMA 1921/2025: *Preeti v. Amit Singh*]. The first motion petition was allowed *vide* order dated 06.12.2025, and the second motion petition is listed on 29.01.2026.

7. In view of the above, list on 02.03.2026 at 03:30 PM.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 27, 2026/‘pv/KA’/