



Serial No. 22
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

Crl.Rev.P. No.9 of 2024

Date of Order: 18.07.2025

Shri. Virender Singh
Aged about 45 years.
S/o Raj Karan Yadav
R/o Dabarpur Village
P.O. Ajerka
P.S. Mundawar, District Alwar, Rajasthan.

..... Petitioner

-VERSUS

1. The State of Meghalaya represented by Chief Secretary
Government of Meghalaya.

2. Smti. Peboni Sangma
D/o Shri. Jangkarnath Joisi
R/o H.No. 69, Rongreng Chidekgre
Village, Williamnagar, Dist- East Garo Hills Meghalaya-794111

..... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. Bhattacharjee, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Appellant(s)	: Mr. M. Lyngdoh, Adv
For the Respondent(s)	: Mr. H. Kharmih, Addl.PP with Mr. S. Sengupta, Addl.PP (R:1) Mr. C.K. Marak, Adv (R:2)

(ORAL)

Heard Mr. M. Lyngdoh, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Mr. H. Kharmih, learned Addl.PP appearing for the State-respondent No.1 and also Mr. C.K. Marak, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.2.

1. By this revision petition, the petitioner has challenged the impugned judgment and order dated 21.07.2023 passed by the learned



Chief Judicial Magistrate in GR Case No.11 of 2022 and also the impugned judgment and order dated 11.07.2024 passed by the learned Sessions Judge in Sessions Case Criminal Appeal No.2 of 2023 whereby the petitioner was convicted u/s 354 IPC and was sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for 1 year and a fine of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Only) and in default, to undergo additional simple imprisonment of 1 year 3 months.

2. The brief fact of the case is that an FIR was lodged by the respondent No.2 before the Williamnagar Women Police Station on 02.04.2022 alleging that the petitioner had outraged her modesty. The said FIR was registered as Williamnagar Women P.S. Case No.06(4)/2022 u/s 354 IPC and the matter was investigated into. Upon completion of the investigation, a charge-sheet vide C.S. No.07/2022 dated 07.05.2022 was submitted and the petitioner was put to trial in GR Case No.11 of 2022 before the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, East Garo Hills District, Williamnagar. At the trial, the petitioner was found guilty by the Trial Court and was convicted by the impugned judgment and order dated 21.07.2023 and was sentenced to undergo 1 year rigorous imprisonment along with a fine of Rs. 10,000/- and in default, to undergo further simple imprisonment for 1 year 3 months. On appeal, the conviction of the petitioner was upheld by the learned Sessions Court Williamnagar by judgment and order dated 11.07.2024 passed in Sessions Case Criminal Appeal No.2 of 2022.

3. Assailing his conviction and sentence, the petitioner has preferred this revision petition before this Court.

4. Mr. M. Lyngdoh, learned counsel for the petitioner, without referring to the merits of the case, submits that the petitioner and the respondent No.2 have compromised the matter between them by a deed of compromise dated 27.03.2024 and at present there exists no dispute between them. The learned counsel further contends that the respondent



No.2 does not hold any further grievance against the petitioner and for the ends of justice it would be appropriate for this Court to set aside the conviction of the petitioner on the basis of the compromise. In support of his contention, the learned counsel for the petitioner places reliance on the decision of the Apex Court reported in (2013) 14 SCC 577, *P. Ramaswamy v. State (Union Territory) of Andaman and Nicobar Islands* and submits that in identical situation the Apex Court had allowed setting aside of conviction on the basis of a compromise between the complainant and the accused. He therefore, submits that similar benefit may be extended to the petitioner in this case and his conviction and sentence may be interfered with.

5. Mr. H. Kharmih, learned Addl.PP appearing for the State-respondent has not objected to the prayer made on behalf of the petitioner and submitted that since the Apex Court has allowed such prayer on the basis of compromise, the petitioner may be given similar benefit.

6. Mr. C.K. Marak, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.2 supports the submission made on behalf of the petitioner and submits that the compromise/settlement has indeed been arrived into between the petitioner and the respondent No.2 and the respondent No.2 is not interested to pursue the matter anymore.

7. Having heard the learned counsels appearing for the parties and on perusal of materials on record, it appears that the petitioner and the respondent No.2 have amicably settled the difference and dispute between them by executing a deed of joint compromise dated 27.03.2024. Further, the respondent No.2 has filed an affidavit dated 04.07.2025 before this Court affirming that she always wanted to compromise the case as the misunderstanding between her and the petitioner arose due to language barrier as she being a villager had no proper understanding of Hindi language. It is further asserted by the respondent No.2 that the settlement/compromise has been made voluntarily and the deed of



compromise dated 27.03.2024 was signed by the parties in the presence of their relatives.

8. In the case of *P. Ramaswamy (Supra)*, the Apex Court in similar situation granted relief to a convict on the basis of compromise entered into by the parties in an offence u/s 354 IPC. It appears that the situation involved in the said case was more or less identical to the situation in the present case.

9. In view of the above, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the prayer made by the petitioner in this case in terms of the decision of the Apex Court in the case of *P. Ramaswamy (Supra)*. Thus, in the circumstances, without going into the question as to the legality and correctness of the conviction and sentence of the petitioner in the criminal case, the petitioner and the respondent No.2 are permitted to compound the offence u/s 354 IPC for which the petitioner was convicted. The said offence shall stand compounded and the composition of this shall have the effect of acquittal in the case in terms of section 320(8) CrPC. The petitioner, as such, is acquitted of the charge u/s 354 IPC.

10. Resultantly, the impugned judgment and order dated 21.07.2023 passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Williamnagar in GR Case No.11 of 2022 along with the related order of sentence and the impugned judgment and order dated 11.07.2024 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Williamnagar in Sessions case Criminal Appeal No.2 of 2023 are set aside.

11. The revision petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Judge

Meghalaya
18.07.2025
"Shrity,PS"