SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			C528/2385/2026 Naresh Gangwar Alias Vikas Patel --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. R.C. Tamta, learned counsel for the applicants. 2. Mr. Vipul Painuali, learned A.G.A. along with Ms. Meenakshi Sharma and Mr. Himanshu Sain, learned Brief Holders for the State. 3. Ms. Priya Mewari, learned counsel for respondent nos.2 & 3 4. Present C-528 application has been filed to quash the chargesheet, impugned summoning/cognizance order dated 12.09.2024 passed by learned FTC/ADJ/Special Judge POCSO Rudrapur in Criminal Case No.742 of 2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 64(1) of B.N.S. and Section 3/4 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 pending before the court of learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate/F.T.S.C. Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar as well as the entire proceedings of the criminal case. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that, as per the prosecution case, the mother of the victim lodged the F.I.R. alleging that the applicant enticed the victim, who is the minor daughter of the complainant, and took her to his house, where he allegedly committed forcible sexual intercourse with her at gunpoint. It is further alleged that the applicant threatened the victim with dire

			consequences, including killing her parents, in case she disclosed the incident to anyone and subsequently, the victim narrated the entire incident to her mother. He would further submit that, at the time of the alleged incident, the victim was a minor, whereas the applicant was a young boy aged about 21 years. 6. Learned counsel would further submit that the applicant and the victim were known to each other and were on friendly terms even at the time of lodging of the F.I.R. He would submit that, after attaining the age of majority, the victim (respondent no. 2) and the applicant solemnized their marriage on 26.10.2026 in accordance with Hindu rites and rituals. He would further submit that, in the meantime, the investigation was concluded and a charge-sheet was submitted against the applicant, on the basis of which the learned trial court took cognizance of the offences alleged against him. 7. It is next contended that the applicant and respondent nos.2 and 3 have now amicably settled their dispute and do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. In this regard, a joint compounding application (I.A. No.1 of 2026) duly supported by the affidavits of the applicant as well as respondent nos.2 and 3 has been filed before this Court stating that the matter has been resolved amicably and that the complainant does not intend to prosecute the applicant any further. 8. The applicant as well as respondent nos.2 and 3 (complainant and victim) are present in person before the Court and have been duly identified by their respective counsel. Upon interaction with the Court,

			respondent no.2/the victim, she does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against the applicant any further since the marriage between them has already been solemnized with the consent of the families and she is presently residing with the applicant and both of them are living together peacefully and discharging their matrimonial obligations. She has categorically stated that she does not wish to prosecute the applicant and has no objection if the criminal proceedings are quashed. 9. Learned State Counsel opposes the application on the ground that the allegations pertain to serious offences which are non-compoundable in nature, particularly under the POCSO Act. However, he does not dispute the factum of compromise between the parties nor the filing of the joint compounding application supported by their affidavits. 10. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. 11. From the material placed before this Court, it appears that the dispute between the parties had arisen in the backdrop of a personal relationship between the applicant and respondent no.2. It is not disputed that the parties have now solemnized marriage after attaining majority and are living together as husband and wife. 13. The presence of the complainant and the victim before this Court and their categorical statements leave no doubt that the compromise arrived at between the parties is voluntary, genuine and without any coercion or undue influence. 14. It is true that the offences alleged are

			non-compoundable. However, it is well settled that the High Court, in exercise of its inherent powers under 582 B.N.S.S., may quash criminal proceedings even in respect of non-compoundable offences, if the Court is satisfied that the dispute is essentially of a personal nature and that continuation of the criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of law. 15. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303 has held that the High Court may quash criminal proceedings in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction where the dispute between the parties is overwhelmingly personal or matrimonial in nature and the parties have resolved their dispute amicably, provided that such exercise of power would secure the ends of justice. 16. Similarly, in Narinder Singh vs. State of Punjab, (2014) 6 SCC 466, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down the principles governing the exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. on the basis of compromise and held that the Court must consider whether the continuation of criminal proceedings would be futile and would not serve the ends of justice. Further, in Parbatbhai Aahir vs. State of Gujarat, (2017) 9 SCC 641, the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterated that the inherent power of the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is of wide amplitude and may be exercised to quash criminal proceedings in order to prevent abuse of the process of the Court or to secure the ends of justice, having regard to the nature of the offence and the circumstances of the case. 17. In the present case, the Court finds that

			the applicant and respondent no.3 are now lawfully married and are living together. The complainant as well as the victim have clearly stated that they do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. In such circumstances, continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no fruitful purpose and would adversely affect the matrimonial life of the parties. 18. Considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the aforesaid judgments, this Court is of the view that this is a fit case for exercising the inherent powers to secure the ends of justice and to prevent abuse of the process of the Court. 19. Accordingly, the compounding application (I.A. No.1 of 2026) is allowed. 20. Consequently, the charge-sheet as well as the cognizance/summoning order dated 12.09.2024 passed by learned FTC/ADJ/Special Judge POCSO Rudrapur in Criminal Case No.742 of 2024 pending before the court of learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate/F.T.S.C. Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar, along with the entire criminal proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed. 21. The present C-528 application is, accordingly, allowed. 22. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of. Mamta MA MTA 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=5de1751a4f1d9cabfd54852c9e68911ca8b66dd26690a191648ab5d8dd004ef0, cn=MAMTA RANI Date: 2026.10.31 18:58:29 +05'30' **(Alok Mahra J.)** 29.10.2026