SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			C528/2353/2026 Masavvar Ali And Others --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Abhishek Joshi and Mr. Ravindra S. Rawat, learned counsel for the applicants. 2. Ms. Meenakshi Sharma and Mr. Himanshu Sain, learned Brief Holders for the State. 3. Mr. Vaibhav Singh Chauhan, learned counsel for respondent nos.2 to 6. 4. Present application under Section 528 of the B.N.S.S., has been filed seeking quashing of the charge-sheet, the summoning/cognizance order dated 21.12.2019 passed in Criminal Case No. 149 of 2020, arising out of the offences punishable under Sections 147, 323, 325, 452, 504 and 506 of the I.P.C. pending before the Court of learned 1st Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dehradun, as well as the entire proceedings of the aforesaid criminal case. 5. Learned counsel for the applicants would submit that the F.I.R. was lodged by the complainant alleging that a dispute had arisen between the parties in relation to painting work, pursuant to which the

			applicants allegedly came armed with weapons and assaulted the father of respondent no. 4, causing him injuries. On the basis of the said allegations, the F.I.R. was registered, and upon completion of the investigation, the Investigating Officer submitted the charge-sheet against the applicants, whereupon the learned Magistrate took cognizance and summoned them to face trial. 6. Learned counsel for the applicants would further submit that the incident occurred due to a sudden scuffle between the parties, in which both sides sustained injuries. It is further submitted that, although the injuries sustained by the parties were grievous in nature, none of them was dangerous to life; that, the dispute arose out of a misunderstanding between the parties, who reside in the same locality. He would also submit that cross-F.I.R.s have been lodged by the parties against each other in respect of the same incident, indicating that the dispute arose out of a mutual altercation, therefore, the continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose, particularly in view of the subsequent amicable settlement between the parties. 7. Learned counsel for the applicants would further submit that the parties have amicably settled their dispute and have decided not to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. A compounding application, along with the affidavits of the parties, has been filed before this Court. The applicants and the respondents are present before the Court through video

			conferencing and have been duly identified by their respective counsel. Upon interaction with the parties, respondent nos. 1 to 4 have acknowledged the settlement and stated that the dispute has been resolved amicably, that they do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against the applicants, and that the compromise has been entered into voluntarily, without any force, pressure or coercion, therefore, the impugned charge-sheet, summoning/cognizance order and consequential criminal proceedings be quashed in view of the amicable settlement. 8. Per contra, learned State counsel would oppose the application on the ground that some of the offences alleged against the applicants are non-compoundable under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C. However, learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of the amicable settlement between the parties or the submission that both sides sustained grievous injuries in the incident, none of which was dangerous to life. 9. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the dispute appears to have arisen out of a personal altercation between the parties in relation to painting work. The parties have lodged cross-F.I.R.s in respect of the same incident, and both sides are stated to have sustained injuries during the altercation. It is further evident that the parties have now amicably resolved their dispute, and the respondents have expressed their

			unequivocal willingness not to pursue the criminal proceedings against the applicants. 10. Although some of the offences alleged against the applicants are non-compoundable under Section 320 Cr.P.C., the inherent jurisdiction of this Court under Section 528 B.N.S.S., is distinct from the statutory power of compounding offences. Such jurisdiction may be exercised to secure the ends of justice, having regard to the nature and gravity of the allegations, the circumstances in which the incident occurred, and the genuineness of the settlement arrived at between the parties. 11. In the present case, the dispute appears to be predominantly personal in nature, and the parties have voluntarily settled their differences. Therefore, the question of quashing the criminal proceedings is required to be considered in the light of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court governing the exercise of inherent jurisdiction in criminal matters involving an amicable settlement, notwithstanding the non-compoundable nature of certain offences. 12. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303 has held that the High Court, in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C., is empowered to quash criminal proceedings in appropriate cases where the dispute is essentially of a private and personal nature and the parties have settled the matter amicably. The said

principle has been reiterated in *Narinder Singh vs. State of Punjab*, (2014) 6 SCC 466 and *State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Laxmi Narayan*, (2019) 5 SCC 688, wherein it has been held that criminal proceedings arising out of personal disputes may be quashed when the parties have resolved their differences and the continuation of such proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of the Court.

13. In the present case, the parties have amicably settled their dispute and the respondents have clearly stated before this Court that he does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against the applicants. In view of the compromise arrived at between the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose.

14. Accordingly, the compounding application is allowed. Consequently, the present C-528 application is also allowed. The charge-sheet and cognizance/ summoning order dated 21.12.2019 passed in Criminal Case No.149 of 2020, pending in the court of learned 1st Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, District Dehradun are hereby quashed *qua* the applicants in terms of the compromise arrived at between the parties.

15. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

Mamta

MAMTA RANI

Digitally signed by MAMTA RANI
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, ou=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, 2.5.4.20=6a81200 5bebfcf46f244f3e584af1449e430ef900bf09a6d67ebbd642671329b, postalCode=263001, st=Uttarakhand, serialNumber=5dc1751a4f1d9cabfd54852c9e68911ca8b66dd26690a191648ab5d8dd004ef0, cn=MAMTA RANI
Date: 2026.10.29 15:59:04 +05'30'

(Alok Mahra, J.)
28.10.2026