HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 50109 of 2025

Raees Alias Nanhe And 4 Others

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Prashant Mishra
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A., Vikas Mishra

Court No. - 79

HON'BLE MADAN PAL SINGH, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicants, and the learned Additional Government Advocate for the State as well as perused the entire material available on record.

2. This application under Section 528 B.N.S.S. has been filed with the prayer to quash the entire proceedings of Sessions Trial No. 240 of 2016 (State Vs. Raees @ Nanhe & Others) arising out of Case Crime No. 416A of 2015 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 504, 506 and 307 I.P.C. Police Station-Shahbad, District-Rampur, pending in the Court of Special Judge, S.C./S.T. Act, Rampur, on the basis of compromised so arrived at between the parties.

3. While entertaining the present criminal application, a Coordinate Bench of this Court passed the order dated 13th January, 2026 as well as this Court vide order dated 6th October, 2026 directed the applicants to file the compromise so entered into between the parties before the trial court for its verification and the trial court was inturn directed to verify the same.

4. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the trial court vide order dated 24th July, 2026 has verified the compromise so arrived at between the parties, a copy of which has been brought on record by means of supplementary affidavit filed in the Court today which is taken on record.

5. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that since the compromised so arrived at between the parties and the same has also been verified by the court below, the entire proceedings of the aforesaid criminal case be may be

quashed by this Court.

6. Learned A.G.A. for the State and learned counsel for opposite party no.2 have no objection, if the proceedings in the aforesaid case are quashed.

7. This Court is not unmindful of the following judgements of the Apex Court:

(i). **B.S. Joshi and others Vs. State of Haryana and Another**; *(2003)4 SCC 675*,

(ii). **Nikhil Merchant Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation**; *(2008) 9 SCC 677,*

(iii). **Manoj Sharma Vs. State and Others**; *(2008) 16 SCC 1,*

(iv). **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab**; *(2012); 10 SCC 303,*

(v). **Narindra Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab;** *(2014) 6 SCC 466,*

(vi).**Dimpey Gujral W/o Vivek Gujral & Others Vs. Union Territory Thru. Administrator Chandigarh & Others**; *(2013) 11 SCC 497,*

(vii). **H.N. Pandakumar Vs. State of Karnataka**; *2025 SCC OnLine SC 38* , and

(viii). **Naushey Ali & Others Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anothe**r; *(2025) 4 SCC 78.*

8. In the aforesaid judgments, the Apex Court has categorically held that compromise can be made between the parties 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. & Another**; *2013 (83) ACC 278.* in which the law expounded by the Apex court in the aforesaid cases has been explained in detail.

9. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, as noted herein above, and also the submissions made by the counsel for the parties, the court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose shall be served by prolonging the proceedings of the above mentioned criminal case as the parties have already settled their dispute.

10. Accordingly, the entire proceedings of Sessions Trial No. 240 of 2016 (State Vs. Raees @ Nanhe & Others) arising out of Case Crime No. 416A of 2015 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 504, 506 and 307 I.P.C. Police Station-Shahbad, District-Rampur, pending in the Court of Special Judge, S.C./S.T. Act, Rampur are hereby quashed.

11. The present application is, accordingly, **allowed.** There shall be no order as to costs.

October 24, 2026
Sushil/-

(Madan Pal Singh,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
SUSHIL KUMAR SINGH
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad