



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>CRLR/562/2026</u> Dalip Sharma --Revisionist Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Raj Kumar Singh, Advocate for the petitioners. Mrs. Pushpa Bhatt, Additional Advocate General for the State of Uttarakhand. Ms. Radha Arya, Advocate for respondent nos.2 & 3. 2. There is a delay of 1899 days in filing the present Criminal Revision. The reasons assigned in the affidavit filed in support of the delay condonation application have been perused and are found to constitute sufficient cause for condoning the delay. Moreover, the parties have jointly filed a compounding application seeking permission to compound the offences, which has also been taken into consideration. In the interest of justice, the delay condonation application (I.A. No. 1 of 2026) is allowed, and the delay in filing the present Criminal Revision is hereby condoned. 3. This Criminal Revision is preferred against the judgment and order dated 29.01.2020 passed by learned 1st Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dehradun in Criminal Case No.3898 of 2012. Revisionist has also challenged the judgment dated 09.02.2021 passed by learned IIIrd Additional Sessions Judge, Dehradun in Misc. Criminal Case No.122 of 2020. By the impugned



		judgment, revisionist has been convicted under Section 325 I.P.C. and sentenced to simple imprisonment for a period of two years with fine of ₹5,000/- and, in default of payment of fine, he was sentenced to undergo fifteen days additional imprisonment. He has also been convicted under Section 504 I.P.C. and has been directed to pay fine of ₹500/- and, in default of payment of fine, he was sentenced to undergo 5 days additional imprisonment. Revisionist has also been convicted under Section 506 I.P.C. and sentenced to simple imprisonment for a period of six months with fine of ₹1,000/- and, in default of payment of fine, he was sentenced to undergo ten days' additional imprisonment. It was directed that all the sentences shall run concurrently. 4. A joint compounding application, duly signed by learned counsel for respondent nos. 2 and 3 as well as learned counsel for the revisionist, has been filed before this Court. In the said application, it has been averred that the dispute between the parties arose on account of irrigation water relating to their agricultural fields. It is further stated that the revisionist and respondent nos. 2 and 3 are neighbours and residents of the same village, and with the intervention of respectable members of the society, they have amicably resolved their dispute. Consequently, they have prayed that the offences, being compoundable in nature, be permitted to be compounded in accordance with law. 5. Today, revisionist and respondent nos. 2 & 3 are present before the Court, who are duly identified by their respective counsels. 6. Both the parties also made a statement that, in view of the settlement, they want to close the matter. 7. Having regard to the amicable settlement arrived at between the parties and the fact that the offences involved are compoundable, this Court is of the
--	--	---

