



2026:AHC:171912

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 48697 of 2025

Mohammad Atif And Another

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ahmad Ali Siddiqui, Aman Srivastava, Mohammad Rizwan Ali, Mohd. Samiuzzaman Khan, Zeeshan Khan
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	Aditya Kumar Arya, G.A., Ramendra Ojha

Court No. - 64

HON'BLE VIVEK VARMA, J.

1. Copy of the report of District Social Welfare Officer, Fatehpur dated 5.2.2026, produced by Sri Anupam Anand, learned Brief Holder for the State, is taken on record.
2. Heard counsel for the applicants, Sri Anupam Anand, learned Brief Holder for the State-opposite party no. 1 and Sri Ramendra Ojha, counsel for the opposite party no. 2. Perused the record.
3. The present application under Section 528 B.N.S.S. has been filed to quash the charge-sheet dated 19.5.2023, cognizance order dated 25.10.2023 and entire proceedings of Session Trial No. 978 of 2023 arising out of Case Crime No. 73 of 2023, under Sections 323, 504, 506 I.P.C., 3(1)da, 3(1)dha, 3(2)(Va) of S.C./S.T. Act, P.S. Sultanpur Ghosh, District Fatehpur, pending before the Additional Sessions Judge/ Special Judge (S.C./S.T. Act), Fatehpur, on the basis of compromise dated 9.9.2025 and its verification dated 3.11.2025 passed by Special Judge, S.C. & S.T. (P.A.) Act, Fatehpur.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that:-

(i) the dispute between the parties were purely civil and private in nature;

(ii) the F.I.R. came to be lodged by the opposite party no. 2 owing to misunderstandings and misgivings between the parties and not on account of any real occurrence, as alleged;

(iii) there never was any criminal intent on part of the applicants nor any criminal offence as alleged had ever occurred.

(iv) at present, the parties to the dispute, have resolved their differences and have made peace;

(v) in view of the settlement reached between the parties, the parties pray another chance be given to them to develop and experience normal relationship;

(vi) the continuance of the criminal trial may in fact hamper the otherwise good chance of the parties enjoying a normal relationship; and

(vii) in such changed circumstances, the opposite party no. 2 does not wish to press charges against the applicants.

5. It is further submitted that compromise deed had been filed by the parties before the court concerned. Further, pursuant to the order dated 7.10.2025 passed by this Court, the parties appeared before the trial Court, whereupon the compromise was duly verified vide order dated 3.11.2025. As per the report dated 5.2.2026, sent by the District Social Welfare Officer, Fatehpur, the compensation received by the informant/victim from the State under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Rules, 1995 has been deposited in the Government exchequer on 4.2.2026.

6. Learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 does not dispute the submissions advanced by the counsel for the applicants or the

correctness of the documents relied upon by him.

7. In view of the fact that the dispute between the parties is essentially civil and private in nature and has been amicably resolved pursuant to a compromise arrived at between them to their complete satisfaction, no useful purpose would be served by permitting the criminal prosecution to continue. Accordingly, in the light of the settled principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of **Narinder Singh vs. State of Punjab**, reported in (2014) 6 SCC 466, **Yogendra Yadav vs. State of Jharkhand**, reported in (2014) 9 SCC 653 and **Parbatbhai Aahir Vs. State of Gujarat** reported in (2017) 9 SCC 641, the entire proceedings of the aforesaid case are hereby quashed.

8. The present application is accordingly, allowed.

August 14, 2026

S.S.

(Vivek Varma,J.)