



2026:AHC-LKO:22543

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

APPLICATION U/S 482 No. - 2658 of 2026

Prashant Shukla

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Deptt. Lko.
And Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Anurag Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 16

HON'BLE SHREE PRAKASH SINGH, J.

Sri Saurabh Singh, Advocate has put in appearance by filing Vakalatnama on behalf of opposite party no. 2 and the same is taken on record.

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

By means of the instant application, the applicant has prayed to quash the impugned chargesheet no. 01 of 2020 filed in case crime no. 226 of 2020 under sections 323, 504 and 506 of IPC 115(2), 351(2), 352 BNS & 3(i)Dha, 3(2) vs SC/ST Act Police Station Itaunja District Lucknow and to quash cognizance order passed in Session No. 551 of 2021.

Learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has 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 06.11.2025. 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 applicant would be a futile exercise and amount to harassment of the applicant.

Adding his arguments, he also submits that this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 17.11.2025 has referred the matter for compromise verification in Application U/S 482 Cr.P.C. No. 9875 of 2025 and in compliance of the

aforesaid order, both the parties have appeared before the trial court and the compromise deed dated 06.11.2025 has been verified in presence of all concerned parties and the order of verification was passed on 30.01.2026 by the trial court. He next added that now the matter has been compromised between the parties, and as such the proceedings of charge sheet submitted in Case Crime No. 226 of 2020 under sections 323, 504 and 506 of IPC 115(2), 351(2), 352 BNS & 3(i)Dha, 3(2) vs SC/ST Act Police Station Itaunja District Lucknow may be quashed.

He next added that the case of the present applicant is squarely covered with the ratio of Judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **Ramawatar Vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021, SCC Online SC 966** and has 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 applicant 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 applicant 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 06.11.2025 and said compromise has been verified on 30.01.2026 and, now, as per the statement of learned counsel for the parties, they do not want to press the aforementioned case, arising out of aforementioned Case Crime No. Case Crime No. 226 of 2020.

In view of the above, as the applicants and opposite parties have entered into compromise on 06.11.2025 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.**

Accordingly, the entire criminal proceedings initiated in pursuance of impugned chargesheet no. 01 of 2020 filed in case crime no. 226 of 2020 under sections 323, 504 and 506 of IPC 115(2), 351(2), 352 BNS & 3(i)Dha, 3(2) vs SC/ST Act Police Station Itaunja District Lucknow and cognizance order passed in Session No. 551 of 2021 are hereby **quashed**.

The compromise deed shall be part of this order.

Consequences to be followed.

The application is **allowed** accordingly.

March 31, 2026

Mayank

(Shree Prakash Singh,J.)