



**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CrI.) NO. 8566/2026)**

.....APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA

...RESPONDENT(S)

ORDER

1. Heard. Leave granted.
2. The present appeal arises out of the Judgment and Order dated 28.04.2025 passed by the High Court of Karnataka in Criminal Appeal No.844 of 2013 affirming the judgment of conviction and sentence dated 24.07.2013 passed by the I Additional Sessions Judge, Mandya in S.C. No.183/2012, whereunder the appellant was convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 324 and 326 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for a period of two years with fine of Rs.2,000/- for the offence under Section 326 IPC and fine of Rs.1,000/- with default sentence for the offence under Section 324 IPC.

3. Briefly stated, the prosecution case was that the appellant/Mahadevaiah being the Husband of the complainant/informant Sannathayamma, who is his wife, assaulted her with a stick on 06.07.2011 causing injuries including fracture to her hand. The Trial Court, upon appreciation of the evidence of the injured witness, eyewitnesses and the medical evidence including the wound certificate and X-ray report, came to the conclusion that the prosecution had proved the offences under Sections 324 and 326 IPC against the appellant and acquitted the other accused persons while convicting the present appellant.
4. The High Court, while dismissing the appeal, held that the testimony of the injured witness stood corroborated by the evidence of her daughter and the medical evidence. The High Court further observed that the injuries, particularly the fracture, clearly attracted the offence under Section 326 IPC and that the sentence imposed by the Trial Court was proportionate to the nature and gravity of the injuries sustained by the complainant.
5. During the pendency of the present proceedings, I.A. No.119646 of 2026 has been filed jointly by the appellant and respondent No.2/complainant seeking permission to compound the offences. In the application, it has been stated that with the intervention of elders, family members and well-wishers, the disputes between the parties, who are husband and wife, have been amicably resolved and they are now residing together peacefully. It

has been further stated that the complainant does not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further and has no objection if the conviction and sentence of the appellant are set aside.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the parties submit that the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion. The parties are personally present before the Court and affirm the settlement arrived at between them.
7. This Court has, in a catena of decisions, permitted compounding and accepted post-conviction settlements in appropriate cases in order to secure complete justice between the parties. In ***Manoj & Anr. v. State of Madhya Pradesh***¹, this Court accepted the compromise and acquitted the appellants for the offence under Section 324 IPC. Similar views were taken in ***Md. Abdul Sufan Laskar v. State of Assam***², ***Mathura Singh v. State of U.P.***³ wherein this Court accepted the compromise and set aside the conviction. In ***Hirabhai Jhaverbhai v. State of Gujarat***⁴, this Court held that once the offence is compounded under Section 320 Cr.P.C., the same shall have the effect of acquittal. In ***Padmalayan v. Sarasan***⁵, this Court permitted post-conviction compromise for the offence under Section 324 IPC. In ***Mohd. Rafi v. State of U.P.***⁶, this Court granted permission to compound the offences under Sections 323 and 325 IPC in

1Criminal Appeal No.1530 of 2008.

2(2008) 9 SCC 333

3(2009) 13 SCC 420.

4(2010) 6 SCC 688.

5(2014) 13 SCC 798.

6Criminal Appeal No. 383 of 1998.

order to maintain cordial relations between the parties and acquitted the appellant.

8. This Court has also consistently held that in exercise of powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, this Court can give quietus to criminal proceedings where the dispute is personal in nature and the parties have genuinely settled their disputes. In the light of the amicable settlement and the complainant's unequivocal consent, as evidenced by the Interlocutory Application, this Court finds it appropriate to allow the present application and permit the compounding of offences. While noting the offense under Section 326 IPC is non-compoundable under the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, in the exceptional circumstances of this case prevailing namely appellant and the complainant being husband and wife, including the voluntary settlement between the parties, which would warrant the exercise of this Court's inherent powers to give effect to the compromise.
9. Having regard to the nature of the dispute, the relationship between the parties, the compromise arrived at between them, and in order to secure complete justice, we are of the considered view that the application seeking permission to compound deserves to be allowed, though learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent No. 1/State has vehemently opposed the same.
10. Respondent-complainant, who is present virtually and she is identified by Shri Shashi Kumar, learned Advocate (Roll No. KAR2857/99). She has

stated in categorical terms that she has entered into the settlement without any force, threat or coercion.

11. In view of the same, we see no impediment to accept the same settlement. Accordingly I.A. No.119646/2026 is partly allowed. The parties are permitted to compound the offences. Consequently the judgement and order dated 28.04.2025 passed by the High Court of Karnataka in Criminal Appeal No.844/2013 and the judgement of conviction and sentence dated 24.07.2013 passed by the First Additional and Sessions Judge, Mandya in SC No.183/2013 is modified and it is held that the period of sentence already undergone would stand substituted to the sentence imposed by the Sessions Court. The appellant is ordered to be released forthwith and a mail be sent to the Registry of this Court within three days from today by the jail superintendent, Mandya.
12. The appellant is acquitted of all the charges. Bail bonds, if any, shall stand discharged.

13. The appeal is accordingly allowed.

14. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
(ARAVIND KUMAR)

.....J.
(PRASANNA B. VARALE)

New Delhi;
May 27, 2026

ITEM NO.58

COURT NO.15

SECTION II-E

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 8566/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 28-04-2025 in CRLA No. 844/2013 passed by the High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru]

MAHADEVAIAH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA

Respondent(s)

IA No. 119644/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING

IA No. 119629/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 119642/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 119646/2026 - PERMISSION TO COMPOUND THE OFFENCE

Date : 27-05-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARAVIND KUMAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASANNA B. VARALE

For Petitioner(s) :M/S. Gururaj & Nayak, AOR

Mr. C B Gururaj, Adv.

Mr. Hari Abishek.p, Adv.

Ms. Pragya Smriti, Adv.

Mr. Dilip Kumar.l, Adv.

Mr. Naveen Chandrashekar, Adv.

Mr. K P Singh, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. K. V. Muthu Kumar, AOR

Ms. Gagandeep Chauhan, Adv.

Ms. Rooh-e-hina Dua, AOR

Ms. Shreya Arora, Adv.

Ms. Shrutika Garg, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

- 1. Leave granted.**
- 2. IA No. 119646/2026 is partly allowed and appeal is allowed in terms of the Signed Order which is placed on the file.**
- 3. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.**

(RASHI GUPTA)

COURT MASTER (SH)

(AVGV RAMU)

COURT MASTER (NSH)