2026:AHC:212703

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 3241 of 2026

Vinod Kumar And Another

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	:	Prashant Kumar, Shivendra Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A., Mayank Gaurav

Court No. - 91

HON'BLE SANTOSH RAI, J.

1. Supplementary affidavit filed, today in Court, on behalf of the appellants is taken on record.

2. Heard learned counsel for the appellants, learned counsel for opposite party no.2 and learned AGA for the State.

3. The present appeal has been filed by the appellants to quash the entire proceedings as well as the impugned cognizance/summoning order dated 22.1.20 passed by Additional District & Session Judge/Special Judge (SC/ST Act), Jalaun at Orai in Special Session Trial No.152 of 2026 (Pravendra Kumar vs. Vinod Kumar & Ors.), arising out of Complaint Case No.81 of 2024, under Sections 115(2), 352, 351(2) BNS and Section 3(2)(va) SC/ST Act, P.S.- Konch, District- Jalaun.

4. The only prayer is for quashing the entire proceedings as well as the impugned cognizance/summoning order. It is contended that as the parties have arrived at a compromise and settled the matter amicably, therefore, proceedings with the case is nothing but futile.

5. This Court by its order dated 31.8.2026 directed the court concerned to verify the compromise. In compliance of the order dated 31.8.2026, copy of the verified compromise dated 28.9.2026 has been transmitted to this Court.

6. Learned counsel for opposite party no.2 submit that he has no objection in case the cognizance order is set aside and charge-sheet is quashed in

the light of the compromise/settlement between the parties. He further submits that no compensation was provided to opposite party nos.2 from the State fund under the SC/ST Act and Rules.

7. It is admitted and contended by the respondents that essentially the dispute is private in nature further that in case proceeding is quashed, the interest of society is not likely to be affected.

8. Learned counsel for the appellants has placed reliance on the judgments of the Apex Court in the case of **Romgopal and others Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2022 (1) SCJ 536, Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab [2012 10 SCC 303], Mohd. Ibrahim Vs. State of U.P., 2022 SCC Online ALL 106, Gold Quest International Ltd. Vs. State of Tamilnadu, 2014 (15) SCC 235, B.S. Joshi Vs. State of Haryana, 2003 (4) SCC 675, Jitendra Raghuvanshi Vs. Babita Raghuvanshi, 2013(4) SCC 58, Madhavarao Jiwajirao Scindia Vs. Sambhajirao Chandrojirao Angre, 1988 1 SCC 692, Nikhil Merchant Vs. C.B.I. and another, 2008(9) SCC 677, Manoj Sharma Vs. State and others, 2008(16) SCC 1, State of M.P. Vs. Laxmi Narayan and others, 2019(5) SCC 688, Narindra Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466, Manoj Kumar and others Vs. State of U.P and others (2008) 8 SCC 781, Union Carbide Corporation and others Vs. Union of India and others (1991) 4 SCC 584, Manohar Lal Sharma Vs. Principal Secretary and others (2014) 2 SCC 532 and Supreme Court Bar Association Vs. Union of India (1998) 4 SCC 409**.

9. Learned AGA could not dispute the fact that the compromise has been entered into between the parties and now the opposite party does not want to proceed with the proceedings in issue.

10. Since both the parties to the dispute have arrived at a compromise and no compensation was provided to opposite party nos.2 from the State fund under the SC/ST Act and Rules, as duly verified by the letter of District Social Welfare Officer, Jalaun at Orai dated 29.9.2026, in such a situation, the Court has inherent jurisdiction to pass a suitable order as may be necessary the larger interest of the parties. .

11. Considering the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the

parties and the nature of dispute/crime, this Court is of the view that no purpose would be served in keeping the proceedings pending before the trial court and hence, the entire proceedings in Special Session Trial No.152 of 2026 (Pravendra Kumar vs. Vinod Kumar & Ors.), arising out of Complaint Case No.81 of 2024, under Sections 115(2), 352, 351(2) BNS and Section 3(2)(va) SC/ST Act, P.S.- Konch, District- Jalaun are hereby quashed in terms of the compromise.

12. Accordingly, the present appeal is **allowed**.

13. Registrar (Compliance) is directed to communicate the instant order to the court concerned through District and Sessions Judge, Kannauj by e-mail/FAX within a week.

(Santosh Rai,J.)

October 9, 2026
RA

Digitally signed by :-
RAZIQ ALI
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad