

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>C528/878/2026</u> <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Abhishek Singh Rawat, learned counsel for the applicants. 2. Ms. Pushpa Bhatt, learned Deputy A.G. along with Mr. S.C. Dumka, learned A.G.A. for the State. 3. Ms. Babita Jalal, learned counsel for respondent no.2. 4. Present C-528 application has been filed seeking quashing of the charge-sheet as well as the summoning/cognizance order dated 22.09.2025 passed in Criminal Case No. 2066 of 2025, arising out of offences under Sections 115(2), 318(4), 324(2), 351(2) and 352 of the B.N.S., pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate (Second), Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar, along with the entire proceedings of the aforesaid case. 5. Learned counsel for the applicants would submit that the F.I.R. was lodged by respondent no. 2/complainant alleging that a sale agreement in respect of a piece of land was executed between the parties and the complainant had paid certain consideration amount to the applicants. It is alleged that despite repeated requests, the applicants failed to execute the sale deed on one pretext or the other. After investigation, the Investigating Officer submitted a charge-sheet, upon which the learned trial court took cognizance. 6. Learned counsel for the applicants would further submit that during the

		pendency of the proceedings, the matter was referred to mediation, where the parties have amicably resolved their dispute. As per the settlement, the applicants have agreed to pay a sum of ₹23,00,000/- to respondent no. 2/complainant towards full and final settlement of all claims, and both parties have agreed to withdraw all cases instituted against each other. It is also agreed that no party shall have any subsisting claim against the other in respect of the subject matter of dispute. 7. A joint compounding application (I.A. No. 1 of 2026), duly supported by affidavits of the applicants as well as respondent no. 2/complainant, has been filed stating that the compromise has been entered into voluntarily, without any coercion, undue influence or pressure, and that the complainant does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 8. The applicants as well as respondent no. 2 are present before the Court in person and have been duly identified by their respective counsel. Upon interaction, respondent no. 2 has affirmed the factum of compromise. The applicants have also handed over a demand draft amounting to ₹23,00,000/- to the complainant in Court. 9. Learned State Counsel would oppose the application; however, he does not dispute the factum of compromise arrived at between the parties. 10. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. 11. From the material on record and the statements made before this Court, it is evident that the dispute between the parties is predominantly civil in nature, arising out
--	--	--

			of a contractual transaction relating to immovable property. The parties have amicably settled their dispute and the entire consideration agreed upon has been paid by the applicants to respondent no. 2. The complainant has voluntarily entered into the compromise and has expressed his unwillingness to pursue the matter any further. 12. It is well settled that the High Court, in exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., can quash criminal proceedings even in respect of non-compoundable offences where the dispute is essentially private in nature and continuation of proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of the Court. 13. In <i>Gian Singh v. State of Punjab</i>, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that criminal proceedings involving non-compoundable offences can be quashed if the dispute is overwhelmingly civil in character and the parties have settled the matter. In <i>Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab</i>, guidelines have been laid down emphasizing that the Court must assess whether continuation of proceedings would be futile and whether quashing would serve the ends of justice. Similarly, in <i>Parbatbhai Aahir v. State of Gujarat</i>, it has been reiterated that the inherent powers of the High Court are to be exercised to prevent abuse of the process of law and to secure the ends of justice. 14. Considering the nature of allegations, the fact that the dispute arises out of a private transaction, and the voluntary settlement arrived at between the parties, this Court is of the view that continuation
--	--	--	---

			of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would amount to abuse of the process of the Court. 15. Accordingly, the compounding application (I.A. No. 1 of 2026) is allowed. 16. Consequently, the charge-sheet as well as the summoning/cognizance order dated 22.09.2025 passed in Criminal Case No. 2066 of 2025, pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate (Second), Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar, and the entire proceedings of the aforesaid case are hereby quashed qua the applicants. 17. The C-528 application is, accordingly, allowed. 18. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of. (Alok Mahra, J.) 06.05.2026 Mamta
--	--	--	--