2026:AHC:212940

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 29964 of 2025

Amandeep Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Amber Khanna, Raj Kumar Khanna, Sandal Khanna

Counsel for Opposite Party(s): G.A.

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 31st March, 2025, cognizance/summoning order dated 1st May, 2025 as well as the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 39621 of 2025 (State Vs. Smt. Sujain Anand), arising out of Case Crime No. 416 of 2021, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 447, 380 and 120-B I.P.C., Police Station-Vrindavan, District-Mathura, pending in the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mathura, 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 15th September, 2025 directing 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 7th October, 2025 has verified the compromise so arrived at between the parties, a copy of which has been brought on record along with the order-sheet of the present application.

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 has 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 Criminal Case No. 39621 of 2025 (State Vs. Smt. Sujain Anand), arising out of Case Crime No. 416 of 2021, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 447, 380 and 120-B I.P.C., Police Station-Vrindavan, District-Mathura, pending in the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mathura are hereby quashed.

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

October 9, 2026
Sushil/-

(Madan Pal Singh,J.)

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