



\$~77

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 938/2026**
HIMANSH MISHRA AND ORSPetitioners
Through: Counsel (appearance not given) and
petitioners in-person.
versus
STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC for the State
with Ms. Chavi Lazurus, Advocate.
S.I. Karishma Kanwat, P.S: Dwarka
South.
Mr. Arvind Gupta, Advocate with Mr.
Deepanshu Solanki, Advocate and
Mr. Jatin Solanki, Advocate for the
complainant.
R-2 in-person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

% **ORDER**
24.03.2026

CRL.M.A. 8900/2026

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

The application stands disposed-of.

W.P.(CRL) 938/2026

By way of the present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with 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. 617/2023 dated 22.12.2023 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Dwarka South, Delhi.



2. The petition is premised on Mediated Settlement Agreement dated 12.03.2025 arrived at before the Mediation Centre, Dwarka Courts, New Delhi and Divorce Decree dated 30.01.2026, 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.
3. The petition is supported by affidavits of the petitioners, as also of respondent No. 2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
4. The petitioners 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.
5. The parties have confirmed that no child was born from the wed-lock.
6. No appeal is stated to have been filed from the divorce decree.
7. The court has queried respondent No. 2, who confirms that she has taken divorce by mutual consent; and that a settlement agreement has been entered into 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.15 lacs from petitioner No. 1; out of which Rs.13 lacs was paid earlier and the balance sum of Rs.02 lacs which was to be paid by way of a demand draft in court, the said amount has instead been remitted to respondent No.2 electronically. Respondent No.2 has confirmed receipt of the said amount. Respondent No. 2 confirms that all aspects of the settlement have now been performed.



8. Mr. Amol Sinha, learned APP confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
9. 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.
10. Accordingly, case FIR No. 617/2023 dated 22.12.2023 registered under sections 498-A/406/34 of the IPC at P.S.: Dwarka South, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
11. Petition stands disposed-of.
12. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MARCH 24, 2026

ds