



\$~59

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Decision: 15th September, 2026

CNR No. DLHC010303812026+ **CRL.M.C. 4930/2026**

ARUN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Riaz Mohammad, Advocate with
petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for the State
with SI Awant, PS Janakpuri.
Respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN****J U D G M E N T (oral)****CRL.M.A. 20675/2026 (exemption)**

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 4930/2026

1. Petitioner herein seeks quashing of FIR No.44/2026 dated 19.02.2026, registered at Police Station Janak Puri, for commission of offence under Section 376 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of settlement between the parties.
2. The abovesaid FIR was registered at the instance of respondent No.2 herein, who claimed that she came in contact of accused i.e. petitioner in August, 2018. They both were working in the same company and they, eventually, developed friendship. On one occasion, petitioner had told her



that he loved her and wanted to marry her and believing his such assurance to be true, she entered into romantic relationship with him and there was also physical relationship between them. However, since she believed his assurance to be truthful and *bonafide* and since he, eventually, refused to marry her, she was compelled to report the matter to police which resulted in registration of FIR in question.

3. After culmination of investigation, charge-sheet has already been filed against the petitioner and offence under Section 69 *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS)*, 2023 has been added.
4. Charges have also, reportedly, been framed under Sections 376 IPC and 69 BNS.
5. Quashing is being sought as the matter has been amicably settled.
6. The parties have amicably settled all their disputes and executed a *Compromise-cum-Settlement Deed* dated 11.06.2026. Copy of such settlement has also been placed on record.
7. The parties have also, reportedly, got married on 24.03.2026.
8. When the matter was taken up by this Court on 16.07.2026, the prosecution was directed to get the abovesaid factum of marriage verified. They were also directed to contact the close family members of the petitioner and respondent No.2 with the additional direction to record their response, if any, with respect to the present petition.
9. Learned Addl. P.P. for the State appears on advance notice and submits that the Investigating Officer has already verified the correctness of the marriage certificate issued by *Arya Samaj Vivah Mandir Trust, Mori Gate, Delhi* and as per verification, the parties have entered into marriage on 24.03.2026. Certificate of marriage is taken on record.



10. The Investigating Officer has also contacted the parents of petitioner as well as respondent No.2 and they have also informed that the petitioner and respondent No.2 have married and are now living happily and that they have no objection to such marriage either. Parents of respondent No.2 have also stated to the concerned SHO that their daughter is residing happily at her matrimonial home and they have no objection to the abovesaid marriage.

11. Respondent No.2 is present in Court and is identified by the Investigating Officer as well as by her counsel.

12. When asked, respondent No.2 reiterated that she is enjoying matrimonial bliss with her husband and would have '*no objection*' to the quashing of FIR in question. She states that they were in relationship for last more than eight years and the FIR had been got registered by her under some misunderstanding. She also states that she had married petitioner out of her own free will and with her full consent and that nobody had forced, threatened, induced or exerted any pressure upon her in any manner, whatsoever, in relation to the said marriage and they are now enjoying blissful marital life together. She, thus, submits that since the marriage has already taken place and she is living happily with petitioner, she is left with no grievance, and would, therefore, have '*no objection*' if the present FIR is quashed

13. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays that since petitioner and respondent No.2 have already got married, continuation with the present criminal proceedings would cast a shadow over their matrimonial life and, therefore, the present FIR be quashed so that the couple leaves behind the bitterness of their past, and begin a new chapter of their life in an atmosphere of peace and harmony.



14. Reference be made to order dated 12.03.2024 passed by this Court in *Abu Bakar v. The State NCT of Delhi & Anr.* in W.P.(CRL.) 782/2024, where in a similar factual matrix, where the prosecutrix had come up with allegation of her being sexually assaulted on the pretext of marriage and later got married to the accused, the proceedings were quashed observing that matter had been amicably settled and complainant was living happily with her husband/accused. Reference was also made to judgments of this Court in *Parmanand Mishra & Anr. v. The State NCT of Delhi & Anr.*; CRL.M.C. 3076/2021, decided on 05.08.2022, *Rocky Massey v. State (NCT of Delhi) & Anr.*; CRL.M.C. 8305/2025, dated 21.11.2025.

15. In *Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*, (2014) 6 SCC 466, the Apex Court had observed that proceedings, even in non-compoundable cases, can be quashed on the basis of settlement provided that the Court is satisfied that there was no meaningful purpose in continuing with the proceedings, and that the scope of conviction was remote and bleak.

16. It will also be useful to make reference to one recent pronouncement of the Apex Court i.e. *Madhukar & Anr. vs. State of Maharashtra* 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1415, which also relates to offence under Section 376 IPC and, when an application was moved by the parties seeking quashing of the proceedings on the basis of settlement, such petition was dismissed by the jurisdictional High Court which compelled the parties to approach Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Apex Court observed as under in para 6:-

“6. At the outset, we recognise that the offence under Section 376 IPC is undoubtedly of a grave and heinous nature. Ordinarily, quashing of proceedings involving such offences on the ground of settlement between the parties is discouraged and should not be



permitted lightly. However, the power of the Court under Section 482 CrPC to secure the ends of justice is not constrained by a rigid formula and must be exercised with reference to the facts of each case.”

17. Resultantly, in the abovesaid case, while taking note of the submission of the victim, wherein she had submitted that she had settled in her personal life and continuing with the criminal proceedings would only disturb her peace and stability, finding complete consistency in her such stance, and noticing the fact that the continuation of the trial would not serve any meaningful purpose and would rather prolong distress for all concerned, especially the complainant, and the burden of the Courts, without the likelihood of a productive outcome, the appeals were allowed and the criminal proceedings were quashed.

18. Keeping in mind the overall facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the parties have amicably settled their disputes and are leading a peaceful matrimonial life, this Court is of the considered view that the continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose. Reference, in this regard, is also made to *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.* (2012) 10 SCC 303.

19. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023*, it is deemed appropriate to quash the instant FIR.

20. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No.44/2026 dated 19.02.2026, registered at Police Station Janak Puri, for commission of offence under Section 376 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is, hereby, quashed. *Compromise-cum-Settlement Deed* dated



11.06.2026 and original affidavits of the parties, copies of which have been placed on record in the present proceedings, shall be submitted before the learned Trial Court within four weeks.

21. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

22. Copy of the order be given *dasti* under signatures of Court Master.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 15, 2026/st/sa