

(2025) 07 UK CK 0663

In the Uttarakhand High Court

Case No : Writ Petition Criminal No. 676 Of 2025

Ejaj Ahmad & Another

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Uttarakhand & Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 18-07-2025

Acts Referred:

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 — Section 109
Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 307

Citation : (2025) 07 UK CK 0663

Hon'ble Judges : Pankaj Purohit, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Mani Kumar, S.C. Dumka, Sweta Badola Dobhal, Manoj Bhatt

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Pankaj Purohit, J

1. By means of the present writ petition, petitioners have put to challenge the F.I.R. No.285 of 2025 dated 19.06.2025, under Section 109 of B.N.S. 2023 registered at Police Station Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar on the basis of compromise entered into between the parties.
2. Along with present criminal writ petition, a joint compounding application has also been filed by the parties, which is duly supported by separate affidavits of the parties.
3. Petitioner no.1 (Ejaj Ahmad), petitioner no.2 (Rizwan Ahmad @ Rizvi) and respondent no.3/informant (Mohd. Imranare present before this Court, duly identified by their respective counsel.
4. In the compounding application, it has been stated by the parties that they have reached to terms of compromise wherefor a settlement has also been arrived at between them. It is thus, prayed that the present first information report be quashed in terms of the compromise arrived at between them.

5. Learned State Counsel raised a preliminary objection to the effect that the offence sought to be compounded is non-compoundable. He further objected to the compounding application on the ground that the offence sought to be compounded are very heinous like 109 of B.N.S. Act i.e. attempt to murder.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners relied upon a judgment rendered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Jaiveer Malik & Another Vs. The State of Delhi passed in Criminal Appeal Nos.864-866 of 2024, wherein, the proceedings arising out of F.I.R. No.223 of 2016 were set aside, which too were registered under Section 307 of IPC, taking recourse of Yogendra Yadav case as noted below.

7. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Yogendra Yadav and Others Vs. State of Jharkhand and Another reported in (2014) 9 SCC 653, in Para 4 it has been observed as under:-

"4. Now, the question before this Court is whether this Court can compound the offences under Sections 326 and 307 of the IPC which are non-compoundable. Needless to say that offences which are non-compoundable cannot be compounded by the court. Courts draw the power of compounding offences from Section 320 of the Code. The said provision has to be strictly followed (Gian Singh v. State of Punjab) (2012) 10 SCC 303. However, in a given case, the High Court can quash a criminal proceeding in exercise of its power under Section 482 of the Code having regard to the fact that the parties have amicably settled their disputes and the victim has no objection, even though the offences are non-compoundable. In which cases the High Court can exercise its discretion to quash the proceedings will depend on facts and circumstances of each case. Offences which involve moral turpitude, grave offences like rape, murder etc. cannot be effaced by quashing the proceedings because that will have harmful effect on the society. Such offences cannot be said to be restricted to two individuals or two groups. If such offences are quashed, it may send wrong signal to the society. However, when the High Court is convinced that the offences are entirely personal in nature and, therefore, do not affect public peace or tranquility and where it feels that quashing of such proceedings on account of compromise would bring about peace and would secure ends of justice, it should not hesitate to quash them. In such cases, the prosecution becomes a lame prosecution. Pursuing such a lame prosecution would be waste of time and energy. That will also unsettle the compromise and obstruct restoration of peace."

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court is of the view that 'if Court is convinced that the offences are entirely personal in nature and, therefore, do not affect public peace or tranquility and where it feels that quashing of such proceedings on account of compromise would bring about peace and would secure ends of justice, it should not hesitate to quash them. In such cases, the prosecution becomes a lame prosecution. Pursuing such a lame prosecution would be waste of time and energy. That will also unsettle the compromise and obstruct restoration of peace'

9. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and the principle enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Yogendra Yadav (Supra), which is reiterated in Jaiveer Malik (Supra), this Court is of the opinion that since the parties have reached to the terms of the compromise, there would remain a remote or bleak possibility of conviction in this case. It can also safely be inferred that it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to permit continuation of the criminal proceedings. Since the answer to the aforesaid points is in affirmative, this Court finds it a fit case to permit the parties to compound the matter.

10. Accordingly, Compounding Application (IA No.1 of 2025) is hereby allowed. The compromise arrived at between the parties is accepted. F.I.R. No.285 of 2025 dated 19.06.2025, under Section 109 of B.N.S. 2023 registered at Police Station Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar, is hereby quashed, qua, the petitioners, subject to the condition that both the petitioners shall deposit Rs.15,000/- before the Uttarakhand High Court Bar Association Advocates' Welfare Fund within fifteen days from today for the reason that the parties have wasted the valuable public time of the investigating agency and further to act as a deterrent against the petitioners so that they would not indulge in such criminal activities in future. Consequently, all the subsequent proceedings pursuant to the impugned F.I.R. qua the petitioners automatically shall come to an end

11. Present criminal writ petition stands allowed accordingly.

12. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of accordingly.