



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPCRL/ 1029/2026</u> Faiyyaz And Ors Petitioners Versus State Of Uttarakhand and Ors Respondents <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Mohd. Safdar, learned counsel for the petitioners. 2. Mr. Rakesh Joshi, learned A.G.A. along with Mr. Manoj Bhatt, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. Mr. Faizan Ali, proxy counsel for Mr. Kamaluddin, learned counsel for respondent nos.3 & 4. 4. By means of the present criminal writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners seek issuance of a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari for quashing the Case Crime/F.I.R. No. 50 of 2026 dated 11.01.2026, registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 191, 191(2), 351(2), 352 of the B.N.S. at Police Station Laksar, District Haridwar along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. 5. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the impugned F.I.R. has been lodged by respondent no. 3 alleging that on 09.01.2026 an altercation took place between the



		accused Faiyyaz and the complainant's son, Farooq. It is alleged that Faiyyaz brought an iron rod and was joined by his father and sons, including the present petitioners, who were armed with lathis, dandas and iron rods. The accused persons allegedly assaulted Farooq, causing injuries on his head. It is further alleged that upon hearing the hue and cry, the brothers of Farooq reached the spot to rescue him, whereupon they were also assaulted by the accused persons. The complainant has further alleged that he somehow managed to save his life. 6. Learned counsel for the petitioners would further submit that the petitioners, the complainant and the injured persons are residents of the same village/locality and the incident in question occurred on account of a sudden quarrel without any premeditation. It is submitted that the petitioners have not been named in the F.I.R., and no specific role has been attributed to them therein. In support of this contention, learned counsel for the petitioners has drawn the attention of this Court to the statement of the injured, wherein the present petitioners have not been named or implicated in the alleged occurrence. 7. He would further submit that that during the pendency of the present writ petition, the parties have amicably settled all their disputes and differences and have entered into a compromise of their own free will, with a view to maintaining peace and cordial relations in the village. It is, therefore, contended that in view of the amicable settlement
--	--	---



		arrived at between the parties, no useful purpose would be served by permitting the criminal proceedings to continue, particularly when the complainant and the injured persons are no longer interested in pursuing the prosecution. Accordingly, it is prayed that the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom be quashed in exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. 8. It is further submitted that a Compounding Application, being I.A. No.1 of 2026, duly supported by separate affidavits sworn by the petitioners as well as respondents nos.3 to 6, has been filed before this Court. In the said application, the parties have categorically stated that they have entered into the compromise voluntarily, of their own free will and without any coercion, pressure, inducement or undue influence and have prayed that the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings be quashed in the interest of justice. 9. Learned State Counsel would oppose the prayer for quashing. However, he does not dispute the filing of the compounding application before this Court. 10. Learned counsel appearing for respondents would fairly submit that the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled and that respondents have no objection if the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed in view of the compromise
--	--	---



		arrived at between the parties. 11. Petitioners and respondents are present before this Court through Video Conferencing and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. Upon interaction with the Court, respondent/injured, stated that the incident had occurred due to a sudden altercation and that the dispute has now been amicably settled. He categorically stated that he has no grievance against the petitioners and has no objection if the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings are quashed. 12. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. 13. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in <i>Gian Singh v. State of Punjab</i>, (2012) 10 SCC 303; <i>Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab</i>, (2014) 6 SCC 466; and <i>State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan</i>, (2019) 5 SCC 688, has held that the High Court may, in exercise of its extraordinary jurisdiction, quash criminal proceedings involving offences having overwhelmingly civil, commercial or personal flavour where the parties have genuinely settled their disputes, provided that such offences are not heinous or of such nature as to have a serious impact on society or public interest. 14. In the present case, the allegations emanate from a personal dispute arising out of a sudden altercation. The injured as well as the informant have appeared before this Court and have categorically stated that they have
--	--	---



			voluntarily settled their disputes with the petitioners and do not intend to pursue the criminal proceedings. This Court is satisfied that the compromise is genuine, voluntary and free from any coercion or undue influence. Having regard to the nature of the dispute, the settlement arrived at between the parties and the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court is of the considered opinion that the possibility of conviction is remote and continuation of the criminal proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of law and would not serve the ends of justice. 15. Accordingly, the Compounding Application (I.A. No.1 of 2026) is allowed. Consequently, the Case Crime/F.I.R. No. 50 of 2026 registered at Police Station Laksar, District Haridwar is hereby quashed <i>qua</i> the present petitioners. 16. The criminal writ petition is, accordingly, allowed. 17. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly. Mamta MA MTA RANI Digitally signed by MAMTA RANI DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, ou=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, 2.5.4.20=6a812005bebfc46f244f3e584af1449e430ef900bf09a6d67ebbd642671329b, postalCode=263001, st=Uttarakhand, serialNumber=5de1751a4f1d9cabfd54852c9e68911ca8b66dd26690a191648ab5d8dd004ef0, cn=MAMTA RANI Date: 2026.07.23 10:44:12 +05'30' (Alok Mahra, J.) 22.07.2026
--	--	--	--