SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			C528/1922/2026 Sameer --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Ms. Divya Jain, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. Manoj Bhatt, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. Mr. Pankaj Singh Karki, 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 FIR No. 0013 of 2023, registered under Section 376 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as the "IPC"), the charge-sheet dated 28.05.2023, submitted under Section 376 IPC, the cognizance order dated 05.06.2023, passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dehradun, in Criminal Case No. 3637 of 2023, under Section 376 IPC, as well as the entire proceedings of Sessions Trial No. 76 of 2023 (State vs. Sameer), pending before the Court of the learned Presiding Officer, Fast Track Special Court/Additional District and Sessions Judge, Dehradun. 3. Along with the present application, an application seeking permission to compound the dispute, being I.A. No. 01 of 2026, has also been filed. The said application bears the signatures of both 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 applicant and respondent no. 2 are present before this Court and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel.

			5. Learned State Counsel has opposed the application seeking permission to compound the dispute. 6. As per the prosecution case, the applicant and the complainant were in a relationship for a considerable period of time. It is alleged that the applicant had initially concealed his identity and that, after the relationship had continued for some time, the complainant came to know that the applicant belonged to a different religion. 7. Upon being queried by this Court, respondent no. 2 has categorically stated that the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled and that she does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against the applicant any further. 8. Upon interacting with the parties and considering the material available on record, this Court is satisfied that both the applicant and respondent no. 2 are majors and have entered into the compromise voluntarily, without any coercion, pressure or undue influence. Respondent no. 2 has unequivocally expressed her willingness to put an end to the dispute and has stated that she has no objection to the criminal proceedings being quashed insofar as the applicant is concerned. 9. Having regard to the nature and circumstances in which the dispute arose, the allegations levelled against the applicant, the subsequent amicable settlement between the parties and the voluntary nature of such 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 interest of justice. 10. 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 settlement between the parties. It has been held that, while exercising such jurisdiction, the Court must take into consideration the nature and gravity of the offence, the circumstances in

which the dispute arose and the impact of quashing the proceedings on society and the ends of justice. Merely because the parties have entered into a settlement, criminal proceedings cannot be quashed as a matter of course. The Court is required to independently examine the facts and circumstances of each case and determine whether the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction would advance the cause of justice.

11. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, and upon an independent consideration of the nature of the dispute and the material available on record, this Court is of the considered opinion that, subject to the allegations and nature of the offence being examined in the light of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the continuation of the criminal proceedings against the applicant would serve no useful purpose and that the ends of justice would be better secured by bringing the proceedings to an end. Accordingly, this Court finds it to be a fit case for exercising its inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS.

12. The Compounding Application is allowed.

13. Consequently, FIR No. 0013 of 2023, registered under Section 376 IPC, the charge-sheet dated 28.05.2023, the cognizance order dated 05.06.2023, passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dehradun, in Criminal Case No. 3637 of 2023, as well as the entire proceedings of Sessions Trial No. 76 of 2023 (State vs. Sameer), pending before the Court of the learned Presiding Officer, Fast Track Special Court/Additional District and Sessions Judge, Dehradun, 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.)
30-10-2026

SHIKSHA SB