SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010184872026 **C528/2266/2026** Memkila --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Vaibhav Singh Chauhan, Advocate for the applicant. 2. Mr. Pramod Tiwari, A.G.A. for the State. 3. Mr. Abhishek Joshi, 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 Criminal Case No. 2673 of 2025, State Vs. Memkila and Others, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B of IPC, pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, 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 one Nihar, on the assurance that he would provide her a Government job, demanded Rs. 6.5 Lakhs from her, out of which, complainant paid him Rs. 1.5 Lakhs and thereafter she was told by Nihar that post is full and he would secure another job if the complainant pay him Rs. 70 Lakhs and in lieu of securing the job, respondent no. 3, who is brother of the

			complaint, executed a gift deed in favour of one Memkila (present applicant), as Nihar had directed the complainant to get the gift-deed executed in favour of the applicant, from whom, he would get the cash, but, despite executing the gift-deed, job was not offered to the complainant. 6. Now, Compounding Application is filed in the matter wherein it is prayed to compound the offences between the parties. 7. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the parties have amicably settled their dispute and have entered into a compromise. 8. Both the parties are present before this Court through video conferencing and are duly identified by their respective counsel. Parties have also filed their respective affidavits stating the facts of compromise between them. 9. 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. 10. At this stage, learned State Counsel raised a preliminary objection to the effect that the offences sought to be compounded are non-compoundable. 11. 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. 12. 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. 13. 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 Criminal Case No. 2673 of 2025, State Vs. Memkila and Others, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B of IPC, pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, District Haridwar, are hereby quashed *qua* the applicant. 14. Accordingly, the present criminal misc. application stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms. **(Alok Mahra J.)** 25.11.2026 Ujjwal