SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			C528/1542/2025 Ankush Sehgal And Anr --Applicants **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand and Another --Respondents **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sharma, learned counsel for the applicants. Mr. N.S. Kaniyal, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. Mr. Rajendra Arya and Mr. Mukesh Kumar Kaparuwan, 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 applicants seeking quashing of the charge-sheet dated 21.08.2021, the summoning order dated 27.09.2021, and the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 4887 of 2021 (Case Crime No. 348 of 2021), *State vs. Ankush Sehgal and Another*, for the offences punishable under Sections 195A and 228A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as the "IPC"), arising out of the case registered at Police Station Kotwali Haldwani, District Nainital, and pending before the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Haldwani, District Nainital. 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 does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 4. The applicants are present in person, while respondent no. 2 is present before this Court through video conferencing. All the parties have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. 5. Learned State Counsel has opposed the application for compounding, contending that the offences alleged are non-compoundable. 6. Upon being interacted with by this Court, respondent no. 2 submits that the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties and that she no longer wishes to pursue the matter any further. 7. 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 no. 2 has unequivocally expressed her desire not to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 8. 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. 9. 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. 10. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, and upon consideration of the nature of the allegations, the material available on record, and the amicable settlement arrived at between the parties, this Court has considered the prayer for quashing the criminal proceedings in the light of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The fact that respondent no. 2 does not wish to pursue the proceedings any further is a relevant consideration. This Court has also taken into account the nature and gravity of the offences alleged, the circumstances in which the dispute arose, and the impact of continuation of the proceedings on the administration of justice. Upon an overall consideration of these aspects, this Court is of the view that quashing the proceedings, insofar as the applicants are concerned, would secure the ends of justice. 11. Consequently, the compounding application (I.A. No. 01 of 2026) is allowed of 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 21.08.2021, the summoning order dated

			27.09.2021, and the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 4887 of 2021 (Case Crime No. 348 of 2021), *State vs. Ankush Sehgal and Another*, for the offences punishable under Sections 195A and 228A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, arising out of the case registered at Police Station Kotwali Haldwani, District Nainital, and pending before the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Haldwani, District Nainital, are hereby quashed qua the applicants. 12. Accordingly, the present criminal miscellaneous application under Section 528 of the BNSS stands disposed of. 13. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 27-10-2026 SUNISHA BINJOLA