SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			C528/2536/2026 Dalbir Singh Negi --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Navnish Negi, learned counsel for the applicants. 2. Ms. Meenakshi Sharma, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. Mr. Himanshu Aswal, learned counsel for respondent no.2. 4. Present C-528 application has been filed seeking quashing of the chargsheet, impugned order dated 07.05.2024 passed by learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kotdwara, Pauri Garhwal in Criminal Case No.2011 of 2024 under Sections 354, 452, 506 and 504 I.P.C. as well as the entire criminal proceedings of the criminal case on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties qua the present applicants. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the F.I.R. was lodged by the complainant alleging that the applicant had forcibly entered her house and attempted to outrage her modesty. He would further submit that the applicant and respondent no. 2/complainant are close relatives and that, owing to a misunderstanding, a dispute had arisen

			between them, which has now been amicably resolved. It is contended that the parties have settled their differences and do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. In support of the aforesaid submission, a joint compounding application (I.A. No. 1 of 2026), duly supported by the affidavits of the applicant and respondent no. 2/complainant, has been filed, wherein the complainant has categorically expressed her unwillingness to prosecute the applicant any further. 6. The applicant and respondent no. 2/complainant are present before this Court through video conferencing and have been duly identified by their respective counsel. Upon interaction with the Court, respondent no. 2/complainant stated that the F.I.R. had been lodged against the applicant on account of a misunderstanding between them; however, the dispute has now been amicably settled. She further stated that the compromise has been arrived at voluntarily, without any pressure or coercion, and that she does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against the applicant any further. 7. Learned State counsel opposes the application on the ground that the offences alleged against the applicant are non-compoundable in nature. However, learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of the compromise arrived at between the parties or the filing of the joint compounding application supported by their respective affidavits. 8. Heard learned counsel for the parties

			and perused the material available on record. 9. From the material available on record, it transpires that the dispute between the applicant and respondent no. 2/complainant arose out of a misunderstanding between them, who are stated to be close relatives. The parties are present before this Court and have been duly identified by their respective counsel. Upon interaction, respondent no. 2/complainant has unequivocally stated that the dispute has been amicably resolved and that she does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against the applicant any further. The joint compounding application, supported by the affidavits of the parties, further corroborates the factum of the settlement. 10. Although the offences alleged against the applicant are non-compoundable in nature, the inherent jurisdiction of this Court under Section 528 of the B.N.S.S. is not restricted by the provisions relating to compounding of offences. The High Court may, in an appropriate case, quash criminal proceedings on the basis of a genuine and voluntary settlement between the parties, where such exercise is necessary to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process of the Court. However, the nature and gravity of the offence, its impact on society and the circumstances in which the compromise has been arrived at are required to be duly considered. 11. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303, and *Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2014)

			6 SCC 466, has explained the principles governing the exercise of inherent jurisdiction for quashing criminal proceedings on the basis of compromise. It has been held that, in cases predominantly involving private or personal disputes, the High Court may quash the proceedings where the compromise is genuine and the continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose. However, such power cannot be exercised in cases involving heinous or serious offences having a substantial impact on society merely because the parties have entered into a settlement. 12. In the present case, the allegations arise out of a dispute between close relatives. The complainant herself has appeared before this Court through video conferencing and has unequivocally stated that the dispute has been amicably resolved and that she does not wish to prosecute the applicant any further. The joint compounding application, along with the affidavits of the parties, also supports the aforesaid settlement. Upon interaction with the complainant, this Court is satisfied that the compromise has been arrived at voluntarily, without any coercion, undue influence or pressure. 13. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the relationship between the parties, the voluntary settlement arrived at between them and the categorical statement of the complainant that she does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further, this Court is of the considered view that the

dispute is predominantly private in nature. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, the likelihood of conviction appears remote, and the continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no fruitful purpose. Accordingly, this Court is satisfied that the present case warrants the exercise of inherent jurisdiction to secure the ends of justice and prevent abuse of the process of the Court.14. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, and in light of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Gian Singh* (supra) and *Narinder Singh* (supra), this Court finds that the present case is a fit one for exercising its inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 of the B.N.S.S.

14. Accordingly, the compounding application (I.A. No. 1 of 2026) is allowed. Consequently, the charge-sheet, the impugned order dated 07.05.2024 passed by the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kotdwara, District Pauri Garhwal, in Criminal Case No. 2011 of 2024, and the entire criminal proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed on the basis of the compromise arrived at between the parties.

16. The present C-528 application stands allowed accordingly.

17. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

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=6a812005bebfcf46f244f3e584af1449e430ef900bf09a6d67ebbd642671329b, postalCode=263001, st=Uttarakhand, serialNumber=5de1751a4f1d9cabfd54852c9e68911ca8b66dd26690a191648ab5d8dd004ef0, cn=MAMTA RANI
Date: 2026.11.26 13:42:09 +05'30'

(Alok Mahra J.)
25.11.2026