SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			C528/2316/2026 Jassi Alias Savej And Ors --Applicants **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand -Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Devansh Dhiman, learned counsel for the applicants. Ms. Meenakshi Sharma, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. Mr. Puneet Uppal, 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 FIR No. 0174 of 2026, dated 03.05.2026, registered under Sections 352 and 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as the "BNS"), at Police Station Kotwali Roorkee, District Haridwar, as well as the charge-sheet dated 03.06.2026, cognizance order dated 29.07.2026 and the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 1040 of 2026, *State vs. Sakib and Others*, under Sections 109, 352 and 3(5) of the BNS, pending before the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Roorkee, District Haridwar, insofar as the applicants are concerned. 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 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 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 compounding of the dispute. 6. Learned counsel for the parties submit that the applicants and respondent no. 2 are daily-wage earners working together and that the incident in question occurred on account of a trivial dispute between them. It is further submitted that, with the intervention of well-wishers and upon mutual understanding, the parties have amicably resolved their differences and do not wish to pursue the matter any further. 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 he does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against the applicants any further. 8. 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 his willingness to put an end to the dispute and has stated that he has no objection to the criminal proceedings being quashed insofar as the applicants are concerned. 9. Having regard to the nature and circumstances in which the dispute arose, the allegations levelled against the applicants, 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 offences, the circumstances in which the dispute arose and the impact of quashing the proceedings on 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 the present case, the dispute appears to have arisen out of a trivial altercation between the parties, who are daily-wage earners and were working together. The parties have subsequently resolved their differences amicably. Respondent no. 2 is present before this Court and has personally affirmed the factum of settlement and expressed his unwillingness to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. The settlement has also been found to be voluntary and free from any coercion or undue influence. 12. 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 offences being examined in the light of the principles laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court, the continuation of the criminal proceedings against the applicants 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. 13. Consequently, the settlement arrived at between the parties is taken on record and the application being

			I.A. No. 01 of 2026 stands disposed of accordingly. The present application under Section 528 of the BNSS is allowed. Accordingly, FIR No. 0174 of 2026 dated 03.05.2026, registered at Police Station Kotwali Roorkee, District Haridwar, under Sections 352 and 109 of the BNS, the charge-sheet dated 03.06.2026, the cognizance order dated 29.07.2026 and the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 1040 of 2026, *State vs. Sakib and Others*, under Sections 109, 352 and 3(5) of the BNS, pending before the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Roorkee, District Haridwar, are hereby quashed qua the applicants. 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 