



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/1519/2026</u> Shamshad Ali --Petitioner Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Sandeep Kothari, learned counsel for the petitioner. 2. Mr. Pradeep Lohani, learned A.G.A. for the State. 3. By means of the present writ petition, the petitioner has invoked the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking quashing of F.I.R. No. 455 of 2026 dated 22.07.2026, registered at Police Station Patel Nagar, District Dehradun, for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 316(2), 324, 351(2), 352 and 69 of the B.N.S., together with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of an amicable settlement entered into between the parties. 4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is a businessman engaged in the business of sale and supply of steel, cement and other construction materials at Dehradun. It is submitted that the petitioner and respondent no.3 came into acquaintance with each other in connection with a property transaction relating to a plot owned by respondent no.3; that, both the petitioner as well as respondent no.3 are



		married and are residing separately with their respective families; that, respondent no.3 had approached the petitioner for assistance in resolving certain issues pertaining to mutation of the aforesaid plot. 5. It is further submitted that when respondent no.3 had gone to Police Station Patel Nagar, she was allegedly compelled by certain persons belonging to an extremist group operating in the locality to lodge the impugned F.I.R. in a particular manner; that, the allegations incorporated in the F.I.R. do not reflect the true facts and were made under coercion, pressure and undue influence exerted by such persons; that, after registration of the F.I.R., both the parties realised that the allegations contained therein did not correctly represent the actual dispute between them and that the criminal proceedings arose on account of such external pressure. 6. Learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that, in connection with the property transaction, the petitioner has already paid a sum of ₹8,34,000/- by cheque and ₹6,66,000/- in cash towards the sale consideration of the plot belonging to respondent no.3. It is submitted that the dispute between the parties was essentially civil and financial in nature. 7. He would further submit that during the pendency of the present writ petition, the parties have amicably resolved all their disputes and differences of their own free will and without any coercion, pressure or undue influence. The complainant is no longer desirous of prosecuting the criminal case and, therefore, continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose. Accordingly, it is prayed that the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings be quashed in exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court.
--	--	---



		8. It is further submitted that a Compounding Application being I.A. No. 2 of 2026, duly supported by separate affidavits sworn by the petitioner as well as respondent no.3, has been filed before this Court. In the said application, both the parties have categorically affirmed that they have entered into the compromise voluntarily, without any coercion, pressure, inducement or undue influence, and have jointly prayed that the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings be quashed in the interest of justice. 9. Learned State Counsel opposes the prayer for quashing of the F.I.R. However, he does not dispute the fact that the parties have filed the aforesaid compromise application before this Court. 10. On the previous date of hearing as well as today, the petitioner and respondent no.3 are present before this Court in person and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. Upon interaction with the Court, respondent no.3 stated that she is about 34 years of age and that the dispute between herself and the petitioner essentially pertained to payment of consideration arising out of the sale of her land. She further stated that the petitioner has already paid ₹8,34,000/- by cheque and ₹6,66,000/- in cash towards the agreed sale consideration. 11. Respondent no.3 further stated before the Court that the allegations levelled in the impugned F.I.R. were made under pressure and coercion exerted by certain persons belonging to an extremist group and that the allegations do not correctly reflect the actual dispute between the parties. She has categorically stated that she has now amicably settled all disputes with the petitioner and does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further.
--	--	---



			12. She has further stated that after she had resolved the dispute with the petitioner and returned home, certain persons assaulted her, pulled her hair, physically assaulted her, threatened her with dire consequences and also intimidated her by allegedly torturing her minor daughter aged about four years. She further stated that although she had undergone medical examination with a view to lodging a complaint regarding the said incident, the medical papers were allegedly snatched away by those persons. 13. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. 14. 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 consistently held that the High Court, in exercise of its inherent or extraordinary jurisdiction, may quash criminal proceedings involving offences having predominantly civil, commercial, financial or personal flavour where the parties have genuinely settled their disputes, provided the offences are not heinous in nature or such as to have a serious impact upon society or public interest. 15. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has further held that while exercising such jurisdiction, the High Court is required to satisfy itself regarding the genuineness and voluntariness of the compromise and whether continuation of the criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of the Court. 16. In the present case, both the petitioner and respondent no.3 are major, are present before this Court in person and have
--	--	--	--



			unequivocally admitted the compromise. Respondent no.3 has categorically stated that she has settled the dispute with the petitioner voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence and that she does not intend to prosecute the criminal proceedings any further. 17. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the background of the dispute, the settlement arrived at between the parties, the statements made by respondent no.3 before this Court, and the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the aforesaid decisions, this Court is satisfied that the compromise is genuine, voluntary and bona fide. The dispute between the parties appears to be predominantly personal and financial in nature. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose. Rather, it would amount to abuse of the process of law and would not advance the ends of justice. 18. Consequently, the Compounding Application (I.A. No. 2 of 2026) is allowed. 19. Accordingly, F.I.R. No. 455 of 2026 dated 22.07.2026, registered at Police Station Patel Nagar, District Dehradun, together with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed. 20. The writ petition is, accordingly, allowed. 21. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of. (Alok Mahra, J.) 07-08-2026 Mamta
--	--	--	---