2026:UHC:10571

Sl. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS

WPCRL/2320/2026

Sadav Ansari Alias Mohd Shadav Ansari

--Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand

--Respondent

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

Mr. D.N. Sharma, learned Counsel for the petitioner.

2. Mr. Bhaskar Chand Joshi, learned AGA for the State.

3. Ms. Manju Bahuguna, learned Counsel for respondent no.3-informant.

4. Petitioner has filed the present petition challenging the FIR No.0178 of 2026 dated 27.10.2026, under Sections 3 and 5 of the Uttarakhand Freedom of Religion Act, 2018 and Sections 351(3) and 64 of the BNS, 2023 registered with Police Station Dineshpur, District U.S. Nagar.

5. Along with the writ petition, Compounding Application (IA/1/2026) has also been filed seeking to compound the offence on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

6. As per the allegations made in the FIR, petitioner called respondent no.3 on the pretext of his birthday in a hotel at Rudrapur and asked her to marry him; on her refusal, he mixed some intoxicant in the cold drink and made her to consume the same and thereafter, he established physical relations with her forcefully; petitioner also showed the incident to his friends on the video call; petitioner thereafter threatened the victim of

her life; once the victim did not go to the petitioner on his call, then he showed the video to victim's husband which resulted into divorce with her husband; petitioner also threatened the victim to viral the photographs and video on the social media; at one occasion, petitioner took her in a mosque where he made her to eat cow beef in the state of unconsciousness; thus, her religion was also changed.

7. Learned Counsel for the petitioner argued that at the time of incident, respondent no.3 was already married; now respondent no.3 has decided to not to continue any personal association with the petitioner or to continue the present criminal proceedings; petitioner is in custody since 29.10.2026; hence the petitioner may be granted protection.

8. On the other hand, learned State Counsel vehemently opposed the writ petition and submitted that it is a serious matter of commission of rape upon the victim; and the victim must be under some pressure for the purpose of compromise.

9. Having heard learned Counsel and upon perusal of the documents annexed with the writ petition, it appears that firstly the offences alleged against the petitioner are non-compoundable; secondly, the allegations are quite serious; even considering the alleged compromise arrived at between the parties, the Court is of the view that compounding application might have been filed under

			some allurement or collateral practices which cannot be permitted at all. 10. In such view of the matter, no case for interference is made out. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. 11. Compounding application also stands rejected accordingly. **(Pankaj Purohit, J.)** 19.11.2026 *R.Dang*

RAJEEV DANG

Digitally signed by RAJEEV DANG
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, ou=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, 2.5.4.20=963da6fc6df8dbb91944e0c58b9ed259ec3d800f419a1199f15a3961c8ca2957, postalCode=263001, st=UTTARAKHAND, serialNumber=65F6E663A1DD44892EED6B81F043D778B37D74D2DB7200F2DABC7ABCC1CA358D, cn=RAJEEV DANG
Date: 2026.11.19 18:40:12 +05'30'