



2026:AHC-LKO:22383

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD  
LUCKNOW**

**APPLICATION U/S 482 No. - 2649 of 2026**

Manju Singh And 2 Others

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Lko

.....Opposite Party(s)

---

|                               |   |                                          |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|
| Counsel for Applicant(s)      | : | Vikas Chandra Dwivedi, Anoop Kumar Singh |
| Counsel for Opposite Party(s) | : | G.A.                                     |

---

**Court No. - 16**

**HON'BLE SHREE PRAKASH SINGH, J.**

Vakalatnama on behalf of the opposite party no.2 filed by Mr. Vinay Mishra, learned counsel is taken on record.

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

By means of the instant application, the applicants have prayed for quashing the impugned charge sheet dated 28-04-2014 with summoning order dated 05.08.2014, contained in Annexure No. 2, as well as entire proceeding of the of Special Session Trial (SC/ST Act) No. 450 of 2017, concerning Case Crime No. 451 of 2013, under Sections, 323, 504, IPC And Sections 3(1)X SC/ST Act, Police Station Mall District Lucknow, pending in the court of Learned Special Judge, SC/ST Act, District Lucknow [State versus Manju Singh and others.], on the basis of the compromise and amicable settlement of the dispute between the parties dated 04-12-2025.

Learned counsel appearing for the applicants submits that the applicants are innocent and have falsely been implicated in the present case. He next added that due to some misunderstanding the instant FIR was lodged and no incident has ever taken place. He next added that thereafter the parties sat together and they have settled their disputes by way of executing compromise deed and that too has been reduced in writing on 4.12.2025. Adding his arguments, he submits that now the parties have put their all disputes at rest by way of executing compromise deed and thus further criminal proceedings against the present applicants would be a futile exercise and would amount to harassment of the applicants.

Adding his arguments, he also submits that this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 6.1.2026 has referred the matter for compromise verification in Application U/S 482 No. 10966 of 2025 and in compliance of the aforesaid

order, both the parties have appeared before the court below and the compromise deed dated 4.12.2025 has been verified in presence of all concerned parties and the order of verification was passed on 16.1.2026. He next added that now the matter has been compromised between the parties, and as such the proceedings of the aforementioned case may be quashed.

He next added that the case of the present applicants is squarely covered with the ratio of Judgment of the ratio of Judgment of the Apex Court rendered in the case of **Ramawatar Vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021, SCC Online SC 966** and has also referred paragraphs nos. 9,10,11 & 16, which are extracted hereinunder:-

"9. Having heard learned Counsel for the parties at some length, we are of the opinion that two questions fall for our consideration in the present appeal. First, whether the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution can be invoked for quashing of criminal proceedings arising out of a 'noncompoundable offence? If yes, then whether the power to quash proceedings can be extended to offences arising out of special statutes such as the SC/ST Act ?

10. So far as the first question is concerned, it would be ad rem to outrightly refer to the recent decision of this Court in the case of Ramgopal & Anr. V. The State of Madhya Pradesh, wherein, a two Judge Bench of this Court consisting of two of us (N.V. Ramana, CJI & Surya Kant, J) was confronted with an identical question. Answering in the affirmative, it has been clarified that the jurisdiction of a Court under Section 320 Cr.P.C cannot be construed as a proscription 3 (1999) 5 SCC 238 4 (2005) 1 SCC 343 5 Criminal Appeal No. 1489 of 2012 against the invocation of inherent powers vested in this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution nor on the powers of the High Courts under Section 482 Cr.P.C. It was further held that the touchstone for exercising the extraordinary powers under Article 142 or Section 482 Cr.P.C., would be to do complete justice. Therefore, this Court or the High Court, as the case may be, after having given due regard to the nature of the offence and the fact that the victim/complainant has willingly entered into a settlement/compromise, can quash proceedings in exercise of their respective constitutional/inherent powers.

11. The Court in Ramgopal (Supra) further postulated that criminal proceedings involving nonheinous offences or offences which are predominantly of a private nature, could be set aside at any stage of the proceedings, including at the appellate level. The Court, however, being conscious of the fact that unscrupulous offenders may attempt to escape their criminal liabilities by securing a compromise through brute force, threats, bribes, or other such unethical and illegal means, cautioned that in cases where a settlement is struck postconviction, the Courts should, inter alia,

carefully examine the fashion in which the compromise has been arrived at, as well as, the conduct of the accused before and after the incident in question. While concluding, the Court also formulated certain guidelines and held:

"19 Nonetheless, we reiterate that such powers of wide amplitude ought to be exercised carefully in the context of quashing criminal proceedings, bearing in mind: (i) Nature and effect of the offence on the conscious of the society; (ii) Seriousness of the injury, if any; (iii) Voluntary nature of compromise between the accused and the victim; & (iv) Conduct of the accused persons, prior to and after the occurrence of the purported offence and/or other relevant considerations." [Emphasis Applied]

16. On the other hand, where it appears to the Court that the offence in question, although covered under the SC/ST Act, is primarily private or civil in nature, or where the alleged offence has not been committed on account of the caste of the victim, or where the continuation of the legal proceedings would be an abuse of the process of law, the Court can exercise its powers to quash the proceedings. On similar lines, when considering a prayer for quashing on the basis of a compromise/settlement, if the Court is satisfied that the underlying objective of the Act would not be contravened or diminished even if the felony in question goes unpunished, the mere fact that the offence is covered under a 'special statute' would not refrain this Court or the High Court, from exercising their respective powers under Article 142 of the Constitution or Section 482 Cr.P.C."

On the other hand, learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 has also supported the version of the applicants and submits that the parties have entered into compromise deed and now there is no dispute in between the parties and thus the criminal proceeding against the applicants may be dropped.

On the other hand, learned AGA appearing for the State has no objection to the contentions aforesaid.

Considering the aforesaid submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, I find that compromise has been entered into between the parties on 4.12.2025 and said compromise has been verified on 16.1.2026 and, now, as per the statement of learned counsel for the parties, they do not want to press the aforementioned Case.

In view of the above, as the applicants and opposite parties have entered into compromise on 4.12.2026 and no grievance remains to be agitated and, as such, further criminal proceedings in the aforementioned criminal case are liable to be set aside in view of the Judgements of the Apex Court rendered in **B.S. Joshi and others Vs. State of Haryana and another (2003)4 SCC**

**675; Nikhil Merchant Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation[2008]9 SCC 677]; Manoj Sharma Vs. State and others ( 2008) 16 SCC 1; Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab (2012) 10 SCC 303; and Narindra Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab ( 2014) 6 SCC 466.**

Resultantly, the criminal proceedings against the applicants in Special Session Trial (SC/ST Act) No. 450 of 2017, concerning Case Crime No. 451 of 2013, under Sections, 323, 504, IPC And Sections 3(1)X SC/ST Act, Police Station Mall District Lucknow, are hereby quashed.

The compromise deed shall be part of this order.

Consequences to be followed.

The application is allowed accordingly.

**March 31, 2026**  
Ram Murti

**(Shree Prakash Singh,J.)**