



2026:AHC:55490

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 6977 of 2025

Rajkumar Yadav Alias Raj Kumar Singh Yadav
And 2 Others

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Rajendra Kumar Srivastava
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 53

HON'BLE SAMIT GOPAL, J.

1. List revised.
2. Heard Sri Rajendra Kumar Srivastava, learned counsel for the applicants, Sri Triveni Saran Rai, learned counsel for the State and perused the records.
3. The present application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed with the prayer to quash the entire proceedings and summoning order dated 20.11.2024 in complaint case no. 35213 of 2024, Smt. Bavita Yadav vs. Raj Kumar Yadav and others, under Sections 498A, 323, 504, 506 I.P.C., P.S. Narkhi, District Firozabad, pending in the court of Additional Judicial Magistrate Ist, Firozabad. It is further prayed to stay the further entire proceedings and summoning order of the said case during pendency of this application.
4. The matter was referred to the Mediation Centre of this Court vide order dated 04.3.2025 for making an effort between the parties for settling their disputes amicably.
5. As per report of Mediation Centre dated 30.7.2025 the parties have amicably settled their dispute and the husband and the wife have decided to reunite and are living together happily and further agreed to withdraw the cases going on between them in view of the settlement agreement.
6. As per the office report dated 17.7.2025 a report from the Mediation Centre of this Court is on record which states that mediation between the

parties is successful.

7. Learned counsel for the applicants argued that it is common ground between the parties that the parties have settled the dispute amicably and the husband and the wife have decided to reunite and are living together happily and therefore the impugned proceedings be quashed on the ground of settlement arrived at between the parties before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court.

8. Learned State counsel could not dispute the factum of compromise.

9. From perusal of the report of Mediation Centre of this Court, it appears that in pursuance of the said order the mediation proceedings were taken up which ended in a settlement dated 30.7.2025 between the parties subject to the terms and conditions mentioned therein and the Mediation succeeded and the husband and the wife have decided to reunite and are living together happily. The parties have settled their grievances and even the dispute arising in the present matter. The parties have agreed to withdraw the cases going on between them, the said fact is mentioned in para 7(३) of the said mediation report.

10. The law with regards to quashing of a case on the basis of settlement arrived between the parties, is well settled. The Apex Court in the cases of **(1) B.S. Joshi and others Vs. State of Haryana and another: (2003)4 SCC 675; (2) Nikhil Merchant Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation : (2008) 9 SCC 677; (3) Manoj Sharma Vs. State and others: (2008) 16 SCC 1; (4) Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab: (2012) 10 SCC 303; (5) Shaifullah and others Vs. State of U.P. And another: 2013 (83) ACC 278 and (6) Parbatbhai Ahir@Parbatbhai @ Bhimsinbhai Karmur and others Vs. State of Gujarat and another: (2017) 9 SCC 641** has held that the cases in which the parties have settled their grievances can be quashed.

11. From perusal of the records and the law laid down by the Apex Court on the subject matter, the present case is a good case for exercising powers by this Court to quash the proceedings/summoning order as prayed for by the applicant(s).

12. The present application is allowed.

13. The proceedings and the summoning order of the case are hereby quashed.

(Samit Gopal,J.)

March 18, 2026

Naresh