SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010073852024 **C482/926/2024** Sachin --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Mohd. Safdar, Advocate for the applicant. 2. Mr. Akshay Latwal, A.G.A. for the State. 3. Mr. Faizan Ali, Advocate for respondent nos. 2 and 3. 4. The present criminal misc. application is filed with a prayer to set-aside the chargesheet, summoning/cognizance order as well as the entire proceedings of S.S.T. No. 76 of 2023, under Sections 363, 376(3), 376(2)(n) of IPC and Section 5(l)/6 of POCSO Act, pending in the court of learned FTC/Addl. Session Judge, Roorkee, District Haridwar, on the basis of compromise between the parties. 5. In this case, an FIR was lodged by the respondent no. 2, in which, it was alleged that applicant induced her daughter and took her away with him. Thereafter FIR-in-question was lodged and chargesheet was filed in the matter against the applicant.

			6. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the date of birth recorded in the school of the victim was 05.07.2008 and at the time of the alleged incident, she was 15 years and 4 months of age. Learned counsel further submits that now applicant and victim have solemnized their marriage with each other after attaining the marriageable age as victim has attained the marriageable age on 05.07.2026. 7. Now, Compounding Application is filed in the matter wherein it is prayed to compound the offences between the parties. 8. Learned counsel for the applicant further submits that the parties have amicably settled their dispute and have entered into a compromise. 9. Both the parties are present before this Court through and are duly identified by their respective counsel. Parties have also filed their respective affidavits stating the facts of compromise between them. 10. The Court interacted with the parties. Upon interaction, it is submitted that now respondent nos. 2 and 3 have amicably settled their dispute with the applicant and they do not want to pursue with the criminal proceedings against the applicant. 11. At this stage, learned State Counsel raised a preliminary objection to the effect that the offences sought to be compounded are non-compoundable. 12. However, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of B.S. Joshi and others Vs. State of Haryana reported in (2003) 4 S.C.C., Page 675, has permitted compounding of non-compoundable offences with the permission

			of Court. 13. Furthermore, Hon'ble Supreme Court, in a catena of its judgments, has observed that in cases where because of the compromise arrived at between the parties, possibility of conviction is remote and bleak, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings as continuation of the same would cause great prejudice and injustice to the accused. 14. Following the aforesaid ratio, the present compounding application is allowed. The offences between the parties are permitted to be compounded. As a result, the entire proceedings of S.S.T. No. 76 of 2023, under Sections 363, 376(3), 376(2)(n) of IPC and Section 5(l)/6 of POCSO Act, pending in the court of learned FTC/Addl. Session Judge, Roorkee, District Haridwar, are hereby quashed *qua* the applicant. 15. Accordingly, the present criminal misc. application stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms. **(Alok Mahra J.)** 25.11.2026 Ujjwal