

SL. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGES'S ORDERS
	<u>31.07.2023</u>		<p>C482 No. 1450 of 2023 And C482 No. 1453 of 2023 <u>Hon'ble Sharad Kumar Sharma, J.</u></p> <p>Mr. Maneesh Bisht, Advocate, for the applicants.</p> <p>Mr. Atul Kumar Sah, Deputy Advocate General, for the State.</p> <p>Mr. Gaurav Singh, Advocate, for the respondents.</p> <p>1. These are two C482 Applications, which are arising from the cross cases.</p> <p>2. As far as C482 Application No. 1450 of 2023, Vijay Singh and others Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others is concerned, it was a complaint which was registered by the respondents Smt. Jogendra Kaur and Mr. Teja Singh as against the present applicants who are named accused in the FIR. The FIR which was registered being FIR No. 626 of 2020 dated 30.11.2020, which was initially registered for the offence under Sections 323, 504 & 506 of IPC, which later on, on completion of the investigation, the offences under Sections 147, 148 and 149 of IPC were introduced by the Investigating Officer when the Chargesheet, being Chargesheet No. 68 dated 11.02.2021 was submitted on which the cognizance have been taken by the Court of Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ramnagar, District Nainital, it had resulted into registration of the Criminal Case No. 709 of 2021, State Vs. Vijay Singh and others.</p>

			<p>3. In this C482 Application, the parties have filed a Compounding Application (IA/1/2023) and they under their joint signatories to the Compounding Application who have supported the contents of the compounding application, which has been duly verified by them, as well as by their respective counsels and they have contended that since they are the residents of the same vicinity, they have settled their disputes amicably with the assistance of senior members of the locality and the complainants do not intend to prosecute the present applicants any further.</p> <p>4. The issue of concern would be the composition of C482 Application No. 1453 of 2023, Rajdeep Singh Rana and others Vs. State of Uttarakhand and others, which was emanating from the FIR, registered by the respondent No. 2, who is the mother of the victim respondent No. 3 Somvati. In the FIR, which was registered, being FIR No. 613 of 2020 dated 23.11.2020, except for the offence under Section 354 (Kha) of IPC and Section 3(1)(x) of the SC/ST Act, all the other offences are compoundable.</p> <p>5. The victim is present in person. She has made a statement and supported the fact that the incident did chanced on 20.11.2020, which was narrated in the FIR, which was a fact though it was attempted to be denied by the applicant accused No. 1 Rajdeep Singh Rana, on the ground that there was a doubt with regard to commission of offence because one of the co-accused person who was said to be equally involved in commission of offence Mr. Ram Singh has been exonerated by the Investigating</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Officer and the Chargesheet has been submitted only against him being Chargesheet No. 44 of 2021 dated 20.01.2021, on which the cognizance have been taken by the Court of District and Sessions Judge, by issuing the order dated 20.02.2021 whereby the applicants have been summoned to be tried for the aforesaid offences in Special Sessions Trial No. 1 of 2021, State Vs. Rajdeep Singh Rana and others.</p> <p>6. The Compounding Application is being opposed by the learned Government Advocate on the ground that two of the major offences, for which the summons have been issued, they are not compoundable, as such, the compounding application deserves to be rejected.</p> <p>7. The applicant No. 1, Rajdeep Singh Rana had made a statement before this Court that in fact the entire controversy has arisen out of there being a land dispute between the two rival factions due to which the FIR and Cross FIR has been registered and his counsel attempted to take an advantage that the prosecution case itself seems to be doubtful when one of the co-accused Ram Singh has already been exonerated by the Investigating Officer, but then the fact remains that during the course of interaction, the victim Somvati had supported the incident in her statement which had chanced on 20.11.2020 and the said statement was made by her in presence of the accused who too is present in person, but he was not specifically able to deny the fact of commission of offence under Section 354(kha) of IPC. But, looking to the overall facts in both the C482 Applications, including the fact and the reasons given in the compounding application, this</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Court is of the view that it would be a case where in order to bring peace and harmony between the two rival factions, who are contesting the proceedings because of the land dispute and particularly in relation to the offence under Section 354(kha), though it is not compoundable under Section 320 of CrPC, the Court under Section 482 of CrPC are not refrained from exceeding to exercise its inherent powers to compound the offence which are otherwise not compoundable and so far as this Court is concerned the same can be commensurated by payment of an adequate compensation to the victim for the act of humiliation committed by the applicant No. 1.</p> <p>8. Hence, these two C482 Applications would stand disposed of and as a consequence thereto, the Criminal Case No. 709 of 2021 State Vs. Vijay Singh and others, pending consideration before the Court of Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ramnagar, District Nainital, would hereby stand quashed in terms of the Compounding Application and consequently, the C482 Application No. 1450 of 2023 would stand disposed of.</p> <p>9. As far as the C482 Application No. 1453 of 2023 is concerned, the proceedings of Special Sessions Trial No. 1 of 2021, State Vs. Rajdeep Singh and others would stand quashed in terms of the compounding application. But, since it relates to some of the non compoundable offences, as it has been opposed by the learned Government Advocate, that could be adequately compensated by directing the applicant No. 1 to pay a compensation of Rs. 45,000/- to the victim Somvati, within a period of three weeks from today.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>10. Apart from the aforesaid imposition of penalty, the applicant No. 1 is directed as under:</p> <p>“1. That the applicant would be planting 10 trees in an area to be identified by the Horticulture Department of his District to which he belongs, at his own cost.</p> <p>2. The plantation of the trees would be made in the respective areas, from which he belongs, under the supervision of the Horticulture Department.</p> <p>3. It is only upon the submission of the certificate of the planting of the ten trees to be issued by the competent authority of the Horticulture Department, which has to be submitted before the competent Court ceased with the criminal proceedings, its then only the proceedings would be dropped, in compliance of the today’s order passed in the present C482 applications.</p> <p>4. If the aforesaid compliance is not made within a period of one month from today, it will automatically result into the revival of the aforesaid criminal proceedings.</p> <p>5. If at any stage, any Officer of the Horticulture Department is found to have issued a fraudulent certificate, he would be criminally dealt with in accordance with law.”</p> <p>11. Owing to above, the matter is compounded and both the C482 Applications would stand disposed of accordingly.</p> <p>12. Let a copy of this judgment be placed in the order sheet of the connected C482 Applications.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Sharad Kumar Sharma, J.) 31.07.2023</p> <p>Mahinder/</p>
--	--	--	--