



2026:AHC:180004

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 49342 of 2025

Kapil Verma And Another

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Abhishek Tiwari, Anurag Kumar Sharma, Gaurav Dwivedi, Gopal Chaturvedi, Mridul Mehar, Priyank Singh, Santosh Kumar Singh, Ullas Mishra

Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A., Prashant Yadav, Rajeev Kumar

Court No. - 80

HON'BLE NAND PRABHA SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicants, learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2, learned AGA for the State and perused the record.

2. The present application under Section 528 BNSS has been filed by the applicants with a prayer to quash the entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 2730 of 2024 (Old Criminal Case No. 1314 of 2021) (State Vs. Kapil Verma and another), Crime No. 1981 of 2019, under Sections 498-A, 323, 504, 506 IPC and 3/4 of D.P. Act, P.S. Kavi Nagar, District Ghaziabad, pending in the court of Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-II, District Ghaziabad as well as to quash the impugned charge sheet dated 19.07.2020 and impugned cognizance order dated 13.01.2021 passed by Chief Judicial Magistrate, District Ghaziabad on the basis of compromise.

3. It is submitted by learned counsel for the parties that the parties appeared before the Court concerned for verification of the compromise dated 18.09.2024, (Annexure No. 4 to the application). The said compromise has been duly verified and the report was forwarded by the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Court No.2, Ghaziabad on 10.07.2026.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the present dispute arises out of personal discord between the applicants and the opposite party no. 2. It is also argued that the opposite party no. 2 is not interested to pursue the

matter pending in the Court concerned and, therefore, the impugned proceedings be quashed on the ground of compromise between the parties and they do not propose to file the counter affidavit and rejoinder affidavit.

5. Learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 admits the arguments of learned counsel for the applicants and states that he has no objection if the impugned proceeding pending against the applicants is quashed.

6. Learned A.G.A. also does not dispute the correctness of the submissions made by the learned counsel for both the parties.

7. In the light of the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in **B.S. Joshi and Others Vs. State of Haryana and another, (2003) 4 SCC 675**, it has been held that *"High Courts have the inherent power under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code (Cr.P.C.) to quash First Information Reports (FIRs) and criminal proceedings, particularly in matrimonial disputes where a genuine settlement has been reached between the parties. The Court clarified that Section 320 Cr.P.C., which lists compoundable offences, does not restrict this power, and exercising it is crucial for promoting amicable settlements and serving the ends of justice, even if the offences are otherwise non-compoundable."*

8. The law with regard to quashing of a case on the basis of settlement arrived between the parties, is well settled. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its Constitutional Bench Judgment in **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and Another, (2012)10 SCC 303**, has held that *"But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and pre-dominantly civil flavour stand on different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim."*

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Parbatbhai Ahir alias Parbatbhai**

Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others vs. State of Gujara and another, (2017) 9 SCC 641 has laid down broad principles of quashing the criminal proceedings in exercise of inherent jurisdiction on the ground that *"even in the non compoundable cases on the basis of compromise, criminal proceedings can be quashed so that valuable time of the court can be saved and utilized in other material cases."*

10. Both the parties have agreed to withdraw the proceedings pending amongst them in Court concerned. From perusal of the records and the law as cited above, the present case is a good case for exercise of power by the Court to quash summoning order as well as entire proceedings.

11. The dispute appears to be purely of a personal nature that has been mutually settled between the parties to their entire satisfaction, therefore, no useful purpose would be served in allowing the prosecution to continue any longer.

12. The present application for quashing filed under Section 528 BNSS comes within the parameters as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Pradeep Kumar Kesarwani Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Another, Criminal Appeal No. 3831 of 2025, SLP (Crl.) No. 11642 of 2019 dated 02.09.2025.**

13. In view of the above, the entire criminal proceedings of Criminal Case No. 2730 of 2024 (Old Criminal Case No. 1314 of 2021) (State Vs. Kapil Verma and another), Crime No. 1981 of 2019, under Sections 498-A, 323, 504, 506 IPC and 3/4 of D.P. Act, P.S. Kavi Nagar, District Ghaziabad, pending in the court of Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-II, District Ghaziabad, are hereby quashed.

14. The present application is, accordingly, ***allowed.***

(Nand Prabha Shukla,J.)

August 25, 2026
Nisha