SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010203582026 **C528/2544/2026** Shahazad Alam --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Mohit Kumar Kashyap, Advocate for the applicant. 2. Mr. Dinesh Chauhan, A.G.A. for the State. 3. Mr. Anuj Singh Kunjwal, Advocate for the respondent no. 2. 4. The present criminal misc. application is filed with a prayer to set-aside the chargesheet, summoning/cognizance order as well as the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 11 of 2025, under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC, pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate, Jaspur, District U.S. Nagar, on the basis of compromise between the parties. 5. In this case, a complaint was filed by the complainant, wherein, it is alleged that applicant took a total sum of Rs. 2.5 Lakhs from the complainant with an assurance that he would be given a job in a company, but, later on, it was discovered that no such company existed and applicant is not returning the money of the complainant.

			Subsequent, the FIR-in-question was lodged. 6. Now, Compounding Application is filed in the matter wherein it is prayed to compound the offences between the parties. 7. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the parties have amicably settled their dispute and have entered into a compromise. 8. Both the parties are present before this Court and are duly identified by their respective counsel. Parties have also filed their respective affidavits stating the facts of compromise between them. 9. The Court interacted with the parties. Upon interaction, it is submitted that now complainant has amicably settled their dispute with the applicant and they do not want to pursue with the criminal proceedings against the applicant. 10. At this stage, learned State Counsel raised a preliminary objection to the effect that the offences sought to be compounded are non-compoundable. 11. However, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of B.S. Joshi and others Vs. State of Haryana reported in (2003) 4 S.C.C., Page 675, has permitted compounding of non-compoundable offences with the permission of Court. 12. Furthermore, Hon'ble Supreme Court, in a catena of its judgments, has observed that in cases where because of the compromise arrived at between the parties, possibility of conviction is remote and bleak, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings as continuation of the same would cause great prejudice and injustice to the accused. 13. Following the aforesaid ratio, the present

			compounding application is allowed. The offences between the parties are permitted to be compounded. As a result, the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 11 of 2025, under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC, pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate, Jaspur, District U.S. Nagar, are hereby quashed *qua* the applicant. 14. Accordingly, the present criminal misc. application stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms. **(Alok Mahra J.)** 18.11.2026 Ujjwal