

**HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL****Criminal Misc. Application U/s 482 No. 439 of 2023****31 July, 2026**

1. Beena Dangwal
- 2: Pallavi Dangwal
- 3: Sandeep Dangwal
- 4: Dinesh Dangwal

--Applicants

Versus

1. State Of Uttarakhand Through District Magistrate,
Tehri Garhwal
- 2: Poonam Dangwal

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Sandeep Kothari, learned counsel for the applicants.

Mr. G.S. Sandhu, learned Addl. Advocate General with Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj,
learned Brief Holder for the State.

Mr. Devang Dobhal, Advocate for the respondent no.2.

Hon'ble Siddhartha Sah, J. (Oral)

The present criminal misc. application is filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. by the applicants seeking quashing of the impugned cognizance order dated 16.01.2023 passed by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tehri Garhwal in Criminal Case No. 21 of 2023, '*State vs. Pradeep Dangwal and others*' under Sections 498-A, 504, 506 of I.P.C. and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act as well as the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 21 of 2023, '*State vs. Pradeep Dangwal and others*' pending in the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tehri Garhwal qua the applicants.



2. During the pendency of the present Criminal Misc. Application, Compounding Application (IA No.05 of 2026) has been filed on behalf of the applicants and respondent no.2.
3. Heard learned counsel for the parties on Compounding Application (IA No.05 of 2026).
4. Applicants – Smt. Beena Dangwal, Pallavi Dangwal, Sandeep Dangwal and Dinesh Dangwal are present through video conferencing. They are duly identified by Mr. Sandeep Kothari, Advocate.
5. The respondent no.2 – Poonam Dangwal alias Poonam Raturi is also present through video conferencing. She is duly identified by Mr. Devang Dobhal, Advocate.
6. An affidavit has been filed in support of the compounding application on behalf of applicants and the respondent no. 2/complainant, Poonam Dangwal. In the affidavit, respondent no.2 has categorically stated that the parties have entered into a compromise and settled their disputes amicably and on 22.12.2025 parties to the matrimony i.e. Pradeep Dangwal and Poonam Dangwal have entered into compromise and have decided to live separately peacefully.
7. It is also stated that the suit for divorce on the



mutual consent is now decreed by the Family Court. A copy of the decree for dissolution of marriage between the parties has been filed along with the affidavit filed in support of compounding application, as Annexure 2.

8. It is also stated in the affidavit of respondent no.2/complainant that since the parties have entered into a compromise and have resolved their dispute amicably, the deponent is not willing to further prosecute the applicants. Hence, it is in the interest of justice that the cognizance order as well as the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 21 of 2023, State v. Pradeep Dangwal and others, pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate may be quashed in terms of the compromise arrived at between the parties.

9. On interaction with respondent no. 2/complainant, who is appearing through video conferencing and is duly identified by her counsel Mr. Devang Dobhal, Advocate, she stated that the matter has been settled with the applicants and she does not want to prosecute the applicants and that the compounding application may be allowed and the criminal proceedings may be quashed.

10. The Court also interacted with the applicants, who are also appearing through video conferencing before



this Court and are duly identified by their counsel Mr. Sandeep Kothari, Advocate. On such interaction, the applicants also stated that the matter has been resolved between the parties amicably and that the compounding application may be allowed and the criminal proceedings may be quashed.

11. Learned State counsel states that since the matter emanates out of matrimonial dispute and the parties have settled their dispute amicably, he does not raise any objection to the compounding application.

12. The offence under Section 498-A IPC is non-compoundable, however, in the cases of “B.S. Joshi and others vs. State of Haryana and another”, (2003) 4 SCC 675, “Nikhil Merchant vs. CBI and another”, (2008) 9 SCC 650 and “Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab”, 2012 (10) SCC 303 as well as in Transfer Petition (Criminal) No. 115 of 2012 (Dimpey Gujral vs. Union Territory of Chandigarh) decided on 06.12.2012, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has permitted the compounding of non-compoundable offence. Also, the Coordinate Bench of this Hon’ble Court in the case of “Kedar Singh and three others vs. State of Uttarakhand and others” reported in 2014 SCC OnLine Utt 2275 has in identical circumstances permitted the compounding of offence



punishable under Section 498-A of IPC.

13. Since respondent no.2/complainant has consented to the compounding of the said offences and since the parties have already settled the matter amicably and the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the aforesaid cases, has permitted compounding in such matters, the compounding application deserves to be allowed.

14. The Compounding Application (IA No. 05 of 2026) is hereby allowed.

15. As a consequence thereof, the cognizance order dated 16.01.2023 passed by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tehri Garhwal in Criminal Case No. 21 of 2023, '*State vs. Pradeep Dangwal and others*' under Sections 498-A, 504, 506 of I.P.C. and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition and the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 21 of 2023, '*State vs. Pradeep Dangwal and others*' pending in the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tehri Garhwal are hereby quashed qua the applicants.

16. The present Criminal Misc. Application under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. is, thus, disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(Siddhartha Sah, J.)

31.07.2026