

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>UKHC010178512025</u> <u>CRLR/762/2025</u> Sarvjeet Singh --Revisionist Versus Dharmendra Singh --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Harsh Vardhan Dhanik, Advocate for the revisionist. 2. Mr. Arjun Arora, Advocate for the respondent. 3. The present criminal revision has been filed with a prayer to set-aside the judgment dated 02.09.2025 passed by 1st Additional District and Sessions Judge, Udham Singh Nagar in Criminal Appeal No. 212 of 2024, Sarvjeet Vs. State of Uttarakhand and Another, under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. 4. Now, a compounding application, jointly signed by learned counsel for the respondent and learned counsel for the revisionist, has been filed duly supported by affidavits of the parties, with a prayer to quash/set-aside the judgment dated 07.10.2024 passed in Criminal Case No. 187 of 2019, Dharmendra Singh Vs. Sarvjeet Singh by the court of Judicial Magistrate, Jaspur, District Udham Singh Nagar as well as the judgment dated 02.09.2025 passed by 1st Additional District and Sessions Judge, Udham Singh Nagar in

		Criminal Appeal No. 212 of 2024. 5. Learned counsel for the revisionist submits that the parties have now entered into a settlement, therefore, the matter needs to be compounded. 6. Learned counsel for the respondent 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. 7. Today, revisionist and the respondent are present before this Court through video conferencing, who are duly identified by their counsels. 8. Both the parties also made a statement that, in view of the settlement, they want to close the matter. 9. 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 revisionist deserves to be acceded to. 10. 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. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring
--	--	---

		groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery. 11. In view of settlement arrived at between the parties, the present criminal revision is allowed. Consequently, the judgment dated 07.10.2024 passed in Criminal Case No. 187 of 2019, Dharmendra Singh Vs. Sarvjeet Singh by the court of Judicial Magistrate, Jaspur, District Udham Singh Nagar as well as the judgment dated 02.09.2025 passed by 1st Additional District and Sessions Judge, Udham Singh Nagar in Criminal Appeal No. 212 of 2024 are hereby set-aside. 12. Compounding application is, accordingly, disposed of. (Alok Mahra J.) 15.07.2026 Ujjwal
--	--	---