2026:AHC:210889

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 8174 of 2026

Shyam Kapoor Gupta And Another

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	:	Nandini Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Satya Prakash, G.A.

Court No. - 91

HON'BLE SANTOSH RAI, J.

1. Appellant No.1, Shyam Kapoor Gupta, had already expired on 06.03.2024. This fact has been specifically and categorically mentioned in the compromise deed executed between the parties, which is duly supported by the accompanying affidavit.

2. Heard Ms.Nandini Pandey, learned counsel for the appellants and Sri Satya Prakash, learned counsel for opposite party no.2 and learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.

3. The present appeal has been filed under Section 14A(1) of S.C. & S.T. Act by the appellants challenging the summoning order dated 09.01.2024 passed by learned Special Judge SC/ST Act, Mirzapur as well as entire proceeding of complaint case No. 98 of 2023 (Raju Kumar Sonkar Vs. Shyam Kapoor Gupta and another), under Sections 323, 504 IPC & 3(1)Da & 3(1)Dha of S.C. & S.T. Act at Police Station-Ahraura, District-Mirzapur.

4. The only prayer is for quashing the 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 19.08.2026 directed the court concerned to verify the compromise. In compliance of the order dated 19.08.2026, copy of the verified compromise dated 19.09.2026 has been transmitted to this Court.

6. Learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 submits that he has no objection in case summoning order is set aside and quashed in the light of the compromise/settlement between the parties.

7. It is admitted and contended by the opposite party no.2 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], Gold Quest International Ltd. Vs. State of Tamilnadu, 2014 (15) SCC 235, Nikhil Merchant Vs. C.B.I. and another, 2008(9) SCC 677, Union Carbide Corporation and others Vs. Union of India and others (1991) 4 SCC 584 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 no.2 does not want to proceed with the proceedings in issue.

10. As per the report submitted by the District Social Welfare Officer, Mirzapur, the informant/victim has not been provided any compensation by the State under the provisions of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

11. Considering the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and taking note of the observations made by Hon'ble Apex Court in the judgments referred above 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 of complaint case No. 98 of 2023 (Raju Kumar Sonkar Vs. Shyam Kapoor Gupta and another), under Sections 323, 504 IPC & 3(1)Da & 3(1)Dha of S.C. & S.T. Act at Police Station-Ahraura, District-Mirzapur 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, Mirzapur by e-mail/FAX.

October 8, 2026 **(Santosh Rai,J.)**
Asha

Digitally signed by :-
ASHA
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad