HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 50609 of 2025

Naveen And 2 Others

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Pawan Kumar Yadav
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	Ajay Kumar, G.A.

Court No. - 80

HON'BLE CHAWAN PRAKASH, J.

1. Heard Mr. Pawan Kumar Yadav, learned Counsel for the applicants, Mr. Dev Kumar Yadav, learned Counsel holding brief of Mr. Ajay Kumar, learned Counsel for opposite party no.2 and learned AGA for the State and perused the records. The supplementary affidavit, filed today, is taken on record.

2. The present application under Section 528 BNSS has been filed by the applicants with the following prayer:

"It is, therefore, Most Respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to allow this Application, and to quash the entire criminal proceeding against the applicants on the basis of compromise in Criminal Case No.43 of 2021 (State Versus Naveen and others), arising out of case crime No.90 of 2018, under Sections 498A, 323, 504, 506 I.P.C., & 3/4 Dowry Prohibition Act, Police Station Mahila Thana District Baghpat, pending in the court of Learned Civil Judge (Junior Division)/FTC Baghpat, as well as to quash the impugned charge sheet No.08 of 2019 dated 7.2.2019 submitted by the Investigating Officer in case crime No.90 of 2018 contained as (Annexure-No.2) to this affidavit, and quash the cognizance order passed by Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Baghpat."

3. Learned Counsel for the applicants has submitted that the applicants and opposite party no.2 have compromised the dispute. It is further argued that the said compromise has also been verified by the concerned Trial Court, as such the proceedings against the applicants may be quashed.

4. Learned counsel for opposite party no.2 admitted the fact of compromise and stated that he has no objection if the proceeding of the aforesaid case are quashed against the applicants.

5. From the perusal of the record it is apparent that parties have entered into compromise and have settled their dispute amicably.

6. The law with regards to quashing of a case on the basis of settlement arrived between the parties is well settled. The Apex Court in the cases of **(1) B.S. Joshi and others Vs. State of Haryana and another: (2003)4 SCC 675; (2) Nikhil Merchant Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation : (2008) 9 SCC 677; (3) Manoj Sharma Vs. State and others: (2008) 16 SCC 1; (4) Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab: (2012) 10 SCC 303; (5) Shaifullah and others Vs. State of U.P. And another: 2013 (83) ACC 278 and (6) Parbatbhai Ahir@Parbatbhai @ Bhimsinbhai Karmur and others Vs. State of Gujarat and another: (2017) 9 SCC 641** has held that the cases in which the parties have settled their grievances can be quashed.

7. Upon perusal of the records and the law laid down by the Apex Court on the subject, this is a fit case for exercising powers of this Court to quash the proceedings, as prayed for by the applicants.

8. The entire proceedings of the aforesaid case, insofar as the present to the present applicants, are hereby **quashed**.

9. The present application is **allowed**.

October 28, 2026
Vijay

(Chawan Prakash,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
VIJAY KUMAR SAHU
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad