



2026:AHC-LKO:22396

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

APPLICATION U/S 482 No. - 2035 of 2026

Dinesh Singh And 5 Others

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Secy. Home Lko. And 5 Others

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Mahendra Pratap Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A., Ranjit Singh

Court No. - 16

HON'BLE SHREE PRAKASH SINGH, J.

1. Sri Ranjit Singh, Advocate has put in appearance by filing Vakalatnama on behalf of opposite party nos. 2 to 5 and the same is taken on record.
2. Heard Mr. Mahendra Pratap Singh, learned counsel for the applicants, learned A.G.A. for the State, Mr. Ranjit Singh, learned counsel for the opposite party nos. 2 to 5 and perused the material placed on record.
3. By means of the instant application, the applicants have prayed to quash the proceedings of the CrI. Case No. 1201 of 2012 under sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 506, 325 & 308 of IPC arising out of Case Crime No. 425 of 2012 under sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 506, 325 and 308 of IPC P.S. Lalganj District Raebareli as well as the proceedings of Criminal Case No. 1200 of 2012 arising out of Case Crime No. 425-A of 2012 under sections 147, 148, 149, 323 & 308 of IPC P.S. Lalganj District Raebareli.
4. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that due to certain misunderstanding, the instant F.I.R. was lodged against the applicants. He added that later on, the parties sat together and have amicably settled their disputes, which has been reduced in writing on 23.02.2026. Thereafter, the applicants filed an Application U/S 482 No. 2035 of 2026 wherein this Court vide order dated 27.02.2026 has directed the trial court to verify the said compromise deed and in compliance thereof, the compromise deed was verified on 17.03.2026. He submits that now there is no dispute in between the parties and they have settled their dispute.
5. Adding his arguments, he submits that as per the ratio of law laid down in

paragraph no. 15.4 in the case of **State of Madhya Pradesh Versus Laxmi Narayan and Others, reported in (2019) 5 Supreme Court Cases, 688**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has formulated the guidelines so far as the compromise under sections 307 readwith section 34 I.P.C. is concerned. Para no. 15.4 of the Judgment in the case of Laxmi Narayan(Supra) is extracted hereinunder:-

"15.4 Offences under Section 307 IPC and the Arms Act, etc. would fall in the category of heinous and serious offences and therefore are to be treated as crime against the society and not against the individual alone, and therefore, the criminal proceedings for the offence under Section 307 IPC and/or the Arms Act, etc. which have a serious impact on the society cannot be quashed in exercise of powers under Section 482 of the Code, on the ground that the parties have resolved their entire dispute amongst themselves. However, the High Court would not rest its decision merely because there is a mention of Section 307 IPC in the FIR or the charge is framed under this provision. It would be open to the High Court to examine as to whether incorporation of Section 307 IPC is there for the sake of it or the prosecution has collected sufficient evidence, which if proved, would lead to framing the charge under Section 307 IPC. For this purpose, it would be open to the High Court to go by the nature of injury sustained, whether such injury is inflicted on the vital/delicate parts of the body, nature of weapons used, etc. However, such an exercise by the High Court would be permissible only after the evidence is collected after investigation and the charge-sheet is filed/charge is framed and/or during the trial. Such exercise is not permissible when the matter is still under investigation. Therefore, the ultimate conclusion in paras 29.6 and 29.7 of the decision of this Court in Narinder Singh should be read harmoniously and to be read as a whole and in the circumstances stated hereinabove."

6. Referring the aforesaid ratio, he submits that in the instant matter, the nature of injuries are as such wherein this court can invoke jurisdiction while exercising its powers under section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of the criminal proceedings. He next added that criminal proceedings initiated in the instant matter would be a futile exercise and therefore, the proceedings initiated in pursuance of Case Crime No. 425 of 2012 and 425-A of 2012, may be quashed.

7. Learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 has also supported the version of the learned counsel for the applicants and submits that parties have amicably settled their dispute and the opposite party no.2 has no grievance, hence, criminal proceedings against the applicants may be dropped.

8. Learned counsel for the State has no objection to the submissions aforesaid.

9. Considering the aforesaid submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, I find that compromise has been entered into between the parties on 23.02.2026 and said compromise has been verified on 17.03.2026 and, now, as per the statement of learned counsel for the parties, they do not want to press the aforementioned criminal proceedings against the applicants.

10. In view of the above, as the applicants and opposite parties have entered into compromise on 23.02.2026 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 Judgments 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.**

11. Accordingly, entire criminal proceedings against the applicants in Crl. Case No. 1201 of 2012 under sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 506, 325 & 308 of IPC arising out of Case Crime No. 425 of 2012 under sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 506, 325 and 308 of IPC P.S. Lalganj District Raebareli and entire proceedings of Criminal Case No. 1200 of 2012 arising out of Case Crime No. 425-A of 2012 under sections 147, 148, 149, 323 & 308 of IPC P.S. Lalganj District Raebareli, are hereby quashed.

12. The compromise shall be part of this order.

13. The application is **allowed** accordingly.

14. Consigned to the records.

March 30, 2026

Mayank

(Shree Prakash Singh,J.)