SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPCRL/2347/2026 Rajesh Kumar Alias Rajesh Bhardwaj --Petitioner **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Mukesh Kumar Kaparuwan, learned counsel for the petitioners. 2. Mr. B.C. Joshi, learned A.G.A. along with Mr. Shweta Badhola Dobhal, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. Mr. Anshuman Singh Chauhan, learned counsel for respondent no.3. 4. By means of the present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners seek quashing of the F.I.R./Case Crime No. 0163 of 2026, registered at Police Station Dineshpur, District Udham Singh Nagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 351(3), 352 and 69 of the B.N.S.), on the basis of the compromise arrived at between the parties. 5. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the aforesaid F.I.R. was lodged by the respondent no.3/complainant, alleging therein that petitioner no.1 had established physical relations with her on the false promise of marriage; that, petitioner no.2 is the mother of petitioner no.1. 6. Learned counsel would further submit

			that petitioner no.1 and respondent no.3 were in a love relationship and that the present dispute arose out of their personal relationship and certain misunderstandings between them. He would submit that the parties have now amicably resolved their differences and petitioner no.1 and respondent no.3 have solemnized marriage with each other and are living happily as husband and wife. 7. In support of the aforesaid submissions, a joint compounding application, being I.A. No.2 of 2026, duly supported by the affidavits of the petitioners and respondent no.3, has been filed before this Court. It is further submitted that the compromise has been arrived at between the parties voluntarily, out of their own free will and without any coercion, pressure or undue influence. Respondent no.3 has categorically stated that she does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further and has no objection if the impugned F.I.R. and consequential proceedings are quashed. 8. Petitioner no.1 and respondent no.3 are present in person before this Court, whereas petitioner no.2 is present through Video Conferencing and have duly identified by their respective learned counsel. Upon interaction with respondent no.3/complainant, she has affirmed the factum of compromise and categorically stated that the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties. She has further stated that she has solemnized marriage with petitioner no.1, that they are living together happily as husband and wife in

			their matrimonial home and that their marriage has also been registered under the provisions of the Uniform Civil Code (U.C.C.). She has further expressed her unwillingness to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 9. Per contra, learned State Counsel would oppose the prayer made in the writ petition on the ground that the allegations levelled in the F.I.R. relate to serious and non-compoundable offences. However, he does not dispute the factum of marriage between petitioner no.1 and respondent no.3 or the fact that a joint compounding application, duly supported by the affidavits of the concerned parties, has been filed before this Court. 10. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. 11. From the material available on record, it emerges that the dispute between the parties originated from their personal relationship. It is not disputed that petitioner no.1 and respondent no.3 have subsequently solemnized marriage with each other and are presently living together as husband and wife. Their marriage has also been registered under the provisions of the U.C.C. 12. This Court has interacted with respondent no.3/complainant, who is present in person before the Court. She has categorically affirmed the compromise arrived at between the parties and expressed her willingness to continue her matrimonial relationship with petitioner no.1. Her statement before this Court, coupled with

			the joint compounding application and the affidavits filed by the parties, establishes that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily, out of their own free will and without any coercion, pressure or undue influence. 13. Although the offences alleged are non-compoundable, the High Court may exercise its inherent jurisdiction to quash criminal proceedings on the basis of a compromise, independently of the statutory power of compounding, where such exercise would secure the ends of justice. In *Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303, *Narinder Singh vs. State of Punjab*, (2014) 6 SCC 466 and *Parbatbhai Aahir vs. State of Gujarat*, (2017) 9 SCC 641, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down that criminal proceedings involving non-compoundable offences may be quashed where the dispute is predominantly private in nature, having regard to the nature and gravity of the offence and the circumstances of the case, to secure the ends of justice. 14. In the present case, petitioner no.1 and respondent no.3 have solemnized marriage and are living together as husband and wife. Respondent no.3 has appeared in person and voluntarily affirmed the compromise, expressing her unwillingness to pursue the criminal proceedings further. This Court is conscious that the allegations under Section 69 of the B.N.S. cannot be treated as a mere matrimonial dispute merely because the parties have subsequently married. However, considering the peculiar facts of the case, the marriage between the parties, their

decision to continue their matrimonial relationship and the unequivocal stand of respondent no.3, this Court is of the view that continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and their quashing would secure the ends of justice.

15. Having considered the nature of the allegations, the subsequent developments between the parties, the voluntary settlement arrived at between them and the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the aforesaid judgments, this Court is of the considered view that the present case warrants interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Consequently, continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would amount to an abuse of the process of law. Accordingly, the joint compounding application (I.A. No.2 of 2026) stands allowed.

16. Consequently, the F.I.R./Case Crime No. 0163 of 2026, registered at Police Station Dineshpur, District Udham Singh Nagar, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed qua the petitioners.

17. The writ petition stands allowed accordingly.

18. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

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: 2026.11.21 16:16:05 +05'30'

(Alok Mahra, J.)
21.11.2026

Mamta