SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			C528/1233/2025 Chanramohan Joshi --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand and Others --Respondents **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Dushyant Mainali, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. Pramod Tiwari, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. Mr. Nikhil Bhatt, learned counsel for respondent no. 2. 2. The present application under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as the "BNSS"), has been filed by the applicant seeking quashing of the charge-sheet dated 14.04.2025, the summoning order dated 13.06.2025, and the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 0693 of 2025, State v. Chandra Mohan Joshi, pending before the Court of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pithoragarh. 3. Along with the present application, a compounding application, being I.A. No. 01 of 2026, has also been filed. The said application bears the signatures of the parties and has been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. The application is supported by affidavits of the parties, wherein it has been stated that they have amicably

			settled their dispute and that respondent no. 2 and the other respondents do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 4. The applicant and respondent nos. 2 to 5 are present before this Court through video conferencing and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. 5. Learned State Counsel has opposed the compounding application. 6. As per the prosecution case, the applicant was driving an Alto car in a rash and negligent manner, resulting in an accident in which the complainant's son and another person, who is the son of respondent no. 3, sustained injuries. 7. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the accident occurred due to a malfunction in the headlights of the vehicle and that the parties have now amicably settled their dispute. 8. Upon interaction with this Court, respondent nos. 2 to 5 have stated that the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties and that they no longer wish to pursue the matter any further. 9. Upon interacting with the parties and considering the material available on record, this Court is satisfied that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily, without any coercion, pressure or undue influence. Respondent nos. 2 to 5 have unequivocally expressed their desire not to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 10. Having regard to the nature and

			circumstances of the dispute, the allegations involved, the fact that the parties have amicably settled their differences, and the voluntary nature of the settlement, this Court has considered whether the continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve any useful purpose or whether the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS is warranted in the interests of justice. 11. In Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303; Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab, (2014) 6 SCC 466; and State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan, (2019) 5 SCC 688, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has elucidated the principles governing the exercise of inherent jurisdiction for quashing criminal proceedings on the basis of a compromise between the parties. While exercising such jurisdiction, the Court must consider the nature and gravity of the offences, the circumstances in which the dispute arose, and whether quashing the proceedings would secure the ends of justice. The mere fact that the parties have entered into a settlement does not, by itself, warrant quashing of criminal proceedings; the Court must independently assess the facts and circumstances of each case. 12. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, the statements made by respondent nos. 2 to 5 before this Court, and the circumstances placed on record, this Court, upon being satisfied that continuation of the proceedings would not serve the ends of justice, finds it appropriate to

			exercise its inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS. 13. Accordingly, the compounding application, being I.A. No. 01 of 2026, is allowed in terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties. In exercise of the inherent jurisdiction vested in this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS, the charge-sheet dated 14.04.2025, the summoning order dated 13.06.2025, and the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 0693 of 2025, State v. Chandra Mohan Joshi, pending before the Court of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pithoragarh, are hereby quashed. 14. Accordingly, the present criminal miscellaneous application under Section 528 of the BNSS stands disposed of in the above terms. 15. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 28-10-2026 SB