



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPCRL/1627/2026</u> Deepanshu Mittal And Ors --Petitioner Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Vikas Kumar Guglani, Advocate for the petitioners. Mr. S.C. Dumka, A.G.A. and Mr. Nikhil Bisht, Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. Mr. Rohit Arora, Advocate for respondent no.3. 2. By means of this writ petition, petitioners have sought quashing of F.I.R. No.0308 of 2025, under Section 80 of B.N.S., 2023, registered at Police Station Transit Camp, District Udham Singh Nagar. 3. Respondent no.3 lodged a complaint against the petitioners, wherein it has been alleged that the marriage of his daughter was solemnized with petitioner no.1 on 22.04.2023. It is further alleged that soon after the marriage, the deceased was subjected to harassment and cruelty by the petitioners in connection with the demand for dowry. It is also alleged that the deceased had earlier delivered a girl child and, upon subsequently conceiving again, a prenatal sex determination test was conducted by the petitioners. According to the complainant, upon



		learning that the foetus was again female, the pregnancy of the deceased was got terminated by the petitioners. It is further alleged that, after the abortion, the health condition of the deceased gradually deteriorated, but she was not provided proper and adequate medical treatment by the petitioners and was not taken to specialized medical facilities despite the alleged deterioration in her condition. Ultimately, the deceased succumbed to her illness on 11.07.2025. 4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the impugned F.I.R. has been lodged after an unexplained and substantial delay of approximately three months from the date of death of the deceased. It is argued that the allegations made therein are general, vague and omnibus in nature and do not attribute any specific overt act to the individual petitioners. Learned counsel further submits that the deceased had developed serious medical complications and, despite the best possible efforts made by the petitioners as well as respondent no.3, her life could not be saved. Learned counsel further submits that respondent no.3, being the father of the deceased and having been deeply attached to his daughter, was under severe emotional distress on account of her unfortunate demise. It is argued that, in a state of grief and emotional turmoil, he lodged the impugned F.I.R. 5. A compounding application, jointly signed by counsel for respondent no.3 and counsel for the petitioners has been filed duly supported by affidavits of petitioners and respondent no.3. 6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that parties have entered into
--	--	---



		settlement, therefore, the matter needs to be compounded. 7. Today, petitioner nos. 1 to 4 and respondent no. 3 are present in person before the Court, whereas petitioner nos. 5 and 6 have joined the proceedings through Video Conferencing and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. 8. Respondent no.3 submits that he, being the father of the deceased, was deeply attached to his daughter and, owing to the unfortunate circumstances surrounding her death, was under considerable emotional distress and mental anguish. It is submitted that, in such a state of grief and distress, he lodged the impugned F.I.R. against the petitioners. He submits that he has now realized that the deceased had, in fact, suffered serious medical complications and that her unfortunate demise occurred on account of the said medical complications. It is further submitted that, in the interregnum, the parties have amicably resolved their dispute and have arrived at a mutual settlement. Respondent no.3, therefore, does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further and desires that the matter be brought to an end so that the parties may restore peace and harmony and move forward in their respective lives. 9. Both the parties also made a statement that, in view of the settlement, they want to close the matter. 10. Having regard to the nature of offence and also considering the broad guidelines issued by Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Gian Singh Vs State of Punjab reported in (2012) 10 SCC 303 and
--	--	--



			Narinder Singh & others Vs State of Punjab & another reported in (2014) 6 SCC 466, request of the petitioners deserves to be acceded to. 11. Since the parties have entered into a compromise, therefore, possibility of the trial resulting into conviction of the accused is remote and bleak and, that being so, continuation of criminal proceedings would visit the accused with great oppression, prejudice and injustice. Rather, it would tantamount to abuse of process of law. 12. In view of above discussion, the writ petition is allowed. F.I.R. No.0308 of 2025, under Section 80 of B.N.S., 2023, registered at Police Station Transit Camp, District Udham Singh Nagar, is hereby quashed along with all the proceedings emanating therefrom. 13. Compounding application (I.A. No.1 of 2026) is, accordingly, disposed of. (Alok Mahra, J.) 24.08.2026 <i>Arpan</i>
--	--	--	---