



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/ 1729/2026</u> Mohd Najim And others --Petitioners Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. B.M. Pingal, learned counsel for the petitioners. 2. Mr. Prabhat Kandpal, learned A.G.A. along with Mr. Jai Prakash Kandpal, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. Mr. M.S. Bisht, learned counsel for respondent no.3. 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. 345 of 2026, dated 18.08.2026 registered under Sections 115(2), 351(2), 352 and 69 of the B.N.S. at Police Station Jaspur, District Udham Singh Nagar along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. 5. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the impugned F.I.R. has been lodged by respondent no.3/complainant alleging that petitioner no.1 and respondent no.3



		were in a relationship for the last three years and that, on the false promise of marriage, petitioner no.1 established physical relations with her on several occasions, but subsequently refused to marry her. It is further submitted that petitioner no.2 is the widowed mother and petitioner no.3 is the real brother of petitioner no.1, and that their implication in the present case is a consequence of misunderstanding, lack of communication and the emotional circumstances prevailing between the parties. 6. Learned counsel for the petitioners would further submit that during the pendency of the present writ petition, the parties have amicably resolved all their disputes and differences and have entered into a compromise voluntarily and of their own free will. It is, therefore, contended that, in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties and the categorical stand of the complainant that she is no longer interested in pursuing the criminal proceedings, no useful purpose would be served by permitting the same to continue. Accordingly, a prayer has been made for quashing of the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, in exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to secure the ends of justice. 7. It is further submitted that the parties have placed on record a Compounding Application, being I.A. No.1 of 2026, duly supported by their respective affidavits. In the said application, the parties have categorically stated that the compromise has been entered into voluntarily, out of their own free will and without any coercion, pressure, inducement or undue influence,
--	--	---



		and that they have no subsisting grievance against each other. On the strength of the said settlement, the parties have prayed for quashing of the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. 8. Learned State Counsel would oppose the prayer for quashing of the impugned F.I.R. However, he does not dispute the factum of compromise arrived at between the parties or the filing of the compounding application before this Court. 9. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents would fairly submit that the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled and that the respondents have no objection to the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom being quashed in view of the compromise arrived at between the parties. 10. The petitioners as well as respondent no.3/complainant are present in person before the Court and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. Upon being interacted with by the Court, respondent no.3/complainant stated that the impugned F.I.R. came to be lodged on account of misunderstanding and that the parties have now amicably resolved their dispute. She further stated that she has no subsisting grievance against the petitioners and that she does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings. She has also stated that she has no objection if the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed. 11. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
--	--	---



			12. 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. 13. In the present case, the allegations arise out of a personal dispute between the parties emanating from their relationship. The complainant has appeared before this Court and, upon interaction, has categorically stated that the dispute has been amicably resolved and that she does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against the petitioners. The compromise has also been placed on record by way of a duly supported application and affidavits of the concerned parties. This Court is satisfied that the settlement arrived at between the parties is voluntary, genuine and free from coercion, pressure, inducement or undue influence. 14. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the subsequent amicable settlement between the parties, the categorical statement of the complainant before this Court and the fact that she has no objection to the quashing of the criminal proceedings, this Court is of the considered opinion that the possibility of the prosecution ultimately resulting in conviction has considerably diminished and that continuation of the criminal
--	--	--	--



			proceedings, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, would serve no fruitful purpose. Rather, permitting such proceedings to continue despite the genuine settlement arrived at between the parties would result in unnecessary continuation of criminal litigation and would not advance 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. 345 of 2026 registered at Police Station Jaspur, District Udham Singh Nagar is hereby quashed. 16. The criminal writ petition is, accordingly, allowed. 17. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly. (Alok Mahra, J.) 24.08.2026 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=6a812005bebfcf46f244f3e584af1449e430ef900bf09a6d67ebbd642671329b, postalCode=263001, st=Uttarakhand, serialNumber=5de1751a4f1d9cabfd54852c9e68911ca8b66dd26690a191648ab5d8dd004ef0, cn=MAMTA RANI Date: 2026.08.25 11:59:28 +05'30'
--	--	--	---