



\$~82

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2186/2026

PURAN SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Ekta Kundu, Advocate with Mr. Arkam Khan, Advocate and Ms. Rakshita Mamgun, Advocate with petitioner Nos.1,2 and 4 in-person. Petitioner No.3 via video-conferencing.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, ASC for the State. Mr. Davinder Pal Kaur, Advocate with Ms. Bhajan, Advocate for the complainant. S.I. Sanjay Nain, P.S: Civil Line, Delhi.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

24.03.2026

%

By way of the present petition filed under section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioners, who are the former husband and in-laws of the complainant/respondent No.2, seek quashing of case FIR No. 358/2019 dated 21.12.2019 registered under sections 498-A/323/506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') and sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 ('Dowry Prohibition Act') at P.S.: Khatima, Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand.

2. *Vidé* order dated 02.02.2023 passed by the Supreme Court in Transfer Petition (Crl.) No.282-283/2022, proceedings emanating *inter-alia* from the subject FIR were transferred to Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.



Copy of order dated 02.02.2023 is appended to the petition as Annexure P-2.

3. The petition is premised on Mediation Settlement dated 14.05.2025 arrived-at through mediation before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi; and Divorce Decree dated 15.11.2025, which is the culmination of petitions under sections 13B(1) and 13B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act 1955, whereby the parties had sought dissolution of their marriage by mutual consent.
4. The petition is supported by affidavits of the petitioners, as also of respondent No.2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
5. Petitioners Nos.1, 2, 4 as well as respondent No. 2 are present in court. Their credentials have been verified and they have also been identified by their respective counsel. Petitioner No.3 has joined the proceedings *via* video-conferencing.
6. The parties have confirmed that one son, *viz.*, Hardik Singh, was born from the wedlock, who is minor as of date.
7. No appeal is stated to have been filed from the divorce decree.
8. The court has queried Ms. Tanuja, respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that a mediated settlement has been signed between the parties; and that in full-and-final settlement of all her claims including towards maintenance (past, present and future), *stridhan*, dowry articles, jewellery, permanent alimony, etc., she was to receive a sum of Rs. 6,50,000/- from petitioner No. 1; out of which Rs.4,00,000/- was paid earlier and the balance sum of Rs.2,50,000/- has also been transferred by petitioner No.1 to respondent No.2, who has since converted it into a fixed



deposit in the name of their minor son. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.

9. Ms. Kiran Bairwa, learned APP confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
10. In the circumstances, in line with the law laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2012) 10 SCC 303 as also in ***Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2014) 6 SCC 466, this court sees no reason why the subject FIR and all proceedings emanating therefrom should not be quashed. This court is of the view that in light of the settlement between the contesting parties, continuing with the subject FIR and all subsequent proceedings would be an exercise in futility and would not be conducive to peace and harmony between the parties.
11. Accordingly, case FIR No. 358/2019 dated 21.12.2019 registered under sections 498-A/323/506 of the IPC and sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act at P.S.: Khatima, Uddham Singh Nagar, Uttrakhand is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
12. Though the settlement deed also records that the minor son shall remain in the custody of respondent No.2 and petitioner No.1 shall have visitation rights on the last Sunday of every alternate month, it is made clear that nothing in this settlement agreement would affect the right of the minor son to meet his father, if and when the son so desires, subject to logistical convenience of the parties.
13. Needless to add that the settlement between the parties leading to the closure of all criminal proceedings by way of the present order will in no way affect the property rights and other rights of the minor son, viz.,



Hardik Singh *vis-à-vis* his father, as may be available under law, in any manner whatsoever.

14. Petition stands disposed-of in the above terms.
15. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MARCH 24, 2026

ds