SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			C528/2495/2026 Satyajeet Bisht Alias Satyajeet Singh Bisht --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Abhishek Verma, learned counsel for the applicant. Mr. Dinesh Chauhan, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand. Ms. Reema Rana, 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 applicant seeking quashing of the charge-sheet dated 22.11.2023, the cognizance and summoning order dated 24.01.2024, and the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 392 of 2024, under Sections 323, 498-A, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as the "IPC"), and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, registered at Police Station Kaladhungi, District Nainital, pending before the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, Haldwani, District Nainital. 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 no. 2 does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 4. The applicant and respondent no. 2 are present before this Court and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. 5. This Court has interacted with the parties. During the interaction, the parties submitted that they have decided to live separately and have already

initiated the first motion proceedings under Section 27 of the Uniform Civil Code (UCC). They further submitted that they have amicably settled their dispute and do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further.

6. Learned State Counsel has opposed the compounding application.

7. Upon interaction with this Court, respondent no. 2 reiterated that the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties and that she no longer wishes 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 no. 2 has unequivocally expressed her intention not to pursue the criminal proceedings any further.

9. Having regard to the nature and circumstances of the dispute, the allegations levelled, the settlement arrived at between the parties 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 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 laid down 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 is required to independently assess the facts and circumstances of each case.

11. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties and the circumstances placed on record, this Court is satisfied that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved and that continuation of

			the criminal proceedings would not serve any fruitful purpose. 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 22.11.2023, the cognizance and summoning order dated 24.01.2024, and the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 392 of 2024, arising out of the case registered at Police Station Kaladhungi, District Nainital, under Sections 323, 498-A, 504 and 506 IPC and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, pending before the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, Haldwani, District Nainital, are hereby quashed. 13. Consequently, 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.)** 05-11-2026 SB