2026:AHC:227062

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 24387 of 2025

Mohammad Ameen Usmani Alias Jafarul And 2 Others

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ajay Pandey, Manvendra Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A., Rahul Yadav

Court No. - 80

HON'BLE CHAWAN PRAKASH, J.

1. Heard Sri Ajay Pandey, learned counsel for applicants, Sri Shivam Pandey, Advocate holding brief of Sri Rahul Yadav, learned counsel for opposite party No.2 and learned AGA for the State.

2. The present application under Section 528 of the B.N.S.S. has been filed by the applicants with a prayer to quash the charge sheet dated 28.5.2024, cognizance/ summoning order dated 23.6.2025 passed by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kaushambi and the entire proceeding of Case No. 4024 of 2025, (State Vs. Mohammad Mohsin @ Monu and others), arising out of case crime No. 151 of 2024, under Sections 498A, 323, 504, 506 I.P.C. and 3/4 Dowry Prohibition Act, Police Station Saini, District Kaushambi, pending in the court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kaushambi.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants submitted that applicants and opposite party no.2 have amicably settled their dispute out of the Court. Applicants approached this Court by filing this application with prayer to quash the proceedings on terms of compromise entered between the parties. By order dated 18.3.2026, this Court directed the parties to appear before the trial court for verification of their identification and the compromise deed. By order dated 3.4.2026, the trial court identified the

parties and the compromise deed. He further submitted that applicants and opposite party no.2 have compromised the matter and that opposite party No.2 does not wish to pursue the aforesaid case against the applicants. He also submitted that applicants and opposite party no.2 have settled their dispute through compromise and, therefore, opposite party no.2 does not wish to pursue the aforesaid case against the applicants. Opposite party no.2 is ready to withdraw the prosecution against the applicants and, in view of the compromise, no fruitful purpose would be served by allowing the prosecution to continue.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the opposite party no.2 does not dispute the correctness of the submission made by learned counsel for the applicants or the correctness of the documents relied upon by him. He submits that opposite party no. 2 has no objection, if the proceedings in the aforesaid case are quashed.

5. Learned AGA submitted that both the parties have settled their dispute out of the court, hence, no reason to proceed further.

6. In **Narindra Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab, (2014) 6 SCC 466, Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Vs. State of Gujarat (2017) 9 SCC, 641, Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab (2012) 10 SCC 303 and State of M.P. Vs. Laxmi Narayanan (2019) 5 SCC 688**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has categorically held that the parties may enter into compromise even in respect of certain cognizable and non-compoundable offences. Reference may also be made to the decision given by this Court in **Shaifullah and others Vs. State of U.P. and another [2013 (83) ACC 278]**, in which, the law expounded by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the aforesaid cases has been explained in detail.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, as noted above, and the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by prolonging the proceedings of the above mentioned case.

8. Accordingly, the proceedings of aforesaid case are hereby quashed insofar as present applicants are concerned.

9. This application under Section 528 of the B.N.S.S. is accordingly **allowed**.

(Chawan Prakash,J.)

November 2, 2026
Md Faisal

Digitally signed by :-
MOHD FAISAL
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad