SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			C528/2375/2026 Faheem Ahmad --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Harshpal Sekhon, learned counsel for the applicant. Ms. Meenakshi Sharma, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. Ms. Manpreet Kaur, learned counsel for respondent nos. 2 and 3. 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 the charge-sheet dated 31.08.2025, the summoning and cognizance order dated 19.11.2025, as well as the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 765 of 2025, arising out of FIR No. 205 of 2025, registered at Police Station Jaspur, District Udham Singh Nagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 85, 115(2), 351(2), 352 and 123 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, pending before the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Jaspur, District Udham Singh Nagar. 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 nos. 2 and 3 do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 4. The applicant and respondent nos. 2 and 3 are present before this Court and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. 5. This Court interacted with the parties. Upon such interaction, both parties submitted that they have mutually decided to live separately and have agreed to initiate proceedings for dissolution of their marriage by mutual consent under the Uniform Civil Code (UCC). They further stated that they have amicably settled their disputes and do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 6. Learned State Counsel opposed the compounding application. 7. Upon interaction with this Court, respondent nos. 2 and 3 reiterated that the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties and that they no longer wish to pursue the criminal proceedings 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 nos. 2 and 3 have unequivocally expressed their intention not to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 9. Having regard to the nature and circumstances of the dispute, the allegations levelled, the fact that the parties have amicably settled their differences, and the voluntary nature of the settlement, this Court has considered whether continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve any useful purpose or whether exercise of

			the inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS is warranted in the interests 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 compromise between the parties. While exercising such jurisdiction, the Court is required to consider the nature and gravity of the offences, the circumstances in which the dispute arose, and whether quashing of the proceedings would secure the ends of justice. The mere fact that the parties have entered into a settlement does not, by itself, warrant quashing of criminal proceedings. The Court must independently assess the facts and circumstances of each case. 11. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, the statements made by respondent nos. 2 and 3 before this Court, and the circumstances placed on record, this Court is satisfied that continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no fruitful purpose and would not advance the ends of justice. Accordingly, this Court finds it appropriate to exercise its inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS to secure the ends of justice. 12. Accordingly, the compounding application, being I.A. No. 01 of 2026, is allowed. Consequently, in exercise of the inherent jurisdiction vested in this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS, the charge-sheet dated 31.08.2025, the summoning and cognizance order dated 19.11.2025, and the entire proceedings

			of Criminal Case No. 765 of 2025, arising out of FIR No. 205 of 2025, registered at Police Station Jaspur, District Udham Singh Nagar, pending before the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Jaspur, District Udham Singh Nagar, are hereby quashed. 13. Accordingly, the present criminal miscellaneous application under Section 528 of the BNSS stands disposed of in the above terms. 14. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 03-11-2026 SB