



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/1619/2026</u> Vandana Kothari --Petitioner Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Sandeep Kothari, Advocate for the petitioner. Mr. Pradeep Lohani, A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. Ms. Gurbani Singh and Ms. Shweta Tiwari, Advocate for respondent no.3. 2. By means of the present writ petition, the petitioner has sought quashing of the F.I.R./Case Crime No.167 of 2023, under Sections 120B, 420, 467, 468, 471 I.P.C., registered at Police Station Doiwala, District Dehradun, and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. 3. A joint compounding application has been filed on behalf of the petitioner and respondent no.3, duly supported by the respective affidavits of the petitioner and the father of respondent no.3. It is stated therein that, during the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have amicably resolved their disputes and differences and have mutually agreed to maintain peace and harmony and live peacefully with each other. It is further stated that, in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, they have agreed to withdraw the cases/proceedings instituted by each of them against the other. It is also stated that the parties have taken steps towards dissolution of their marriage by mutual consent and have already filed the



			first motion under Section 27 of the Uniform Civil Code, Uttarakhand, for seeking divorce by mutual consent. 4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that parties have entered into settlement, therefore, the matter needs to be compounded. 5. Learned counsel for respondent no.3 submits that dispute has now been amicably settled between the parties, therefore, his client wants to close the matter to ensure that peace is restored. 6. Today, petitioner and respondent no.3 joined the proceedings through Video Conferencing, who are duly identified by their respective counsels. 7. Both the parties also made a statement that, in view of the settlement, they want to close the matter. 8. Having regard to the nature of offence and also considering the broad guidelines issued by Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Gian Singh Vs State of Punjab reported in (2012) 10 SCC 303 and Narinder Singh & others Vs State of Punjab & another reported in (2014) 6 SCC 466, request of the petitioner deserves to be acceded to. 9. Since the parties have entered into a compromise, therefore, possibility of the trial resulting into conviction of the accused is remote and bleak and, that being so, continuation of criminal proceedings would visit the accused with great oppression, prejudice and injustice. Rather, it would tantamount to abuse of process of law. Ends of justice would be met if criminal proceedings are put to an end, because this would allow the parties to translate their decision to live in peace in the reality. The only consideration for the compromise reached between the parties seems to be their desire to bury the hatchet for all times to
--	--	--	--

