
(1999) 05 SC CK 0055

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Criminal Appeal No's. 497-98 of 1999

Surendra Nath Mohanty and Anr

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Orissa

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 04-05-1999

Acts Referred:

Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) — Section 320
Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) — Section 307, 323, 324, 325, 326

Citation : (1999) 2 ACR 1306 : AIR 1999 SC 2181 : (1999) AIRSCW 2199 :
(1999) 1 ALD(Cri) 874 : (2000) 89 CLT 130 : (1999) CriLJ 3496 : (1999) 2 CTC
263 : (1999) 3 JT 408 : (1999) 3 SCALE 103 : (1999) 5 SCC 238 : (1999) 2 SCR
1005 : (1999) 4 Supreme 421 : (1999) 2 UJ

Hon'ble Judges : M.B. Shah, J;K. T. Thomas, J;D.P. Mohapatra, J

Bench : Full Bench

Advocate : Vijay Hansaria and Sunil Jain, for Jain Hansaria and Co, for the
Appellant; Jana Kalyan Das, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

M.B. Shah, J.—Leave granted.

2. These appeals are filed against the judgment and order dated 5th September, 1997 and 10th November, 1997 passed by the High Court of Orissa at Cuttack in Criminal Revision No 436 of 1994 and Miscellaneous Case No. 521 of 1997 whereby Revision Petition against the conviction order and the application for correction, alteration and for compounding offence filed by the appellants were rejected.

3. The appellants were convicted and sentenced u/s 307, 326, 325, 324 & 323 read with Section 34. I.P.C. and sentenced to 5 years R.I. and fine of Rs. 200 in default of payment of which to undergo R.I. for one month. That Order was challenged before the High Court by filing Criminal Revision No. 436 of 1994. After considering the entire evidence on record, the Court held that from the nature and extent of the injuries sustained by the injured, and also from the

manner in which the car struck against the injured, it was difficult to come to a conclusion that the intention of the accused was to kill the injured and, therefore, it would be hazardous to uphold their conviction u/s 307 I.P.C. After considering the injuries caused to the witness, the High Court altered the conviction of the appellants u/s 326, 325, 324 & 323 read with Section 34 I.P.C. and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and the affidavit of the witness produced on record, the Court imposed sentence of six month's R.I and fine of Rs.1,000 in default of payment of which to undergo R.I for further three months for the offence u/s 326 IPC and no separate sentence was imposed on the other counts of offences. Against that order, these appeals are filed by special leave.

4. It is vehemently contended by the learned Counsel for the appellants that as the dispute was amicably settled and the matter was compromised, the High Court ought to have granted permission to compound the offences and ought not to have convicted the appellants and imposed the sentence. For this purpose, reliance is placed upon the decisions of this Court in *Ram Pujan and Others Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh*, and *Darshan Singh and Another Vs. State of Punjab*, As against this, learned Counsel for the respondent submitted that the offence u/s 326 is not compoundable and the High Court has rightly rejected the application for compounding the same. He, for this purpose, relied upon the Judgment of this Court in *Ram Lal and Another Vs. State of Jammu and Kashmir*, wherein after referring to Section 320(9) of the CrPC, the Court observed that the decision in *Mahesh Chand (supra)* was rendered per incuriam.

5. In our view, submission of the learned Counsel for the respondent requires to be accepted. For compounding of the offences punishable under the Indian Penal Code, complete scheme is provided u/s 320 of the CrPC, 1973. Sub-section (1) of Section 320 provides that the offences mentioned in the table provided thereunder can be compounded by the persons mentioned in Column No. 3 of the said table. Further Sub-section (2) provides that, the offences mentioned in the table could be compounded by the victim with the permission of the Court. As against this, Sub-section (9) specifically provides that "no offence shall be compounded except as provided by this Section." In view of the aforesaid legislative mandate, only the offences which are covered by table 1 or 2 as stated above can be compounded and the rest of the offences punishable under Indian Penal Code could not be compounded.

6. Further, decision in *Ram Pujan's case (supra)* does not advance the contention raised by the appellants. In the said case, the Court held that major offences for which accused have been convicted were no doubt non-compoundable, but the fact of compromise can be taken into account in determining the quantum of sentence. In *Ram Lal (supra)*, the Court referred to the decision of this Court in *Y. Suresh Babu Vs. State of A.P. and Another*, and to the following observations made by the Supreme Court in AIR 1988 2111 (SC) and held as under:

We gave our anxious consideration to the case and also the plea put forward for seeking permission to compound the offence. After examining the nature of the

case and circumstances under which the offence was committed, it may be proper that the trial court shall permit them to compound the offence.

7. In the case of Y. Suresh Babu the Court has specifically observed that the said case "shall not be treated as a precedent." The aforesaid two decisions are based on facts and in any set of circumstances,, they can be treated as per incuriam as pointed attention of the court to Sub-section (9) of Section 320 was not drawn. Hence, the High Court rightly refused to grant permission to compound the offence punishable u/s 326.

8. We reiterate that the course adopted in Ram Pujan v. State of U.P. and Ors. and Mahesh Chand and Anr. v. State of Rajasthan (supra) was not in accordance with law. However, considering the fact the parties have settled their dispute outside the Court and the fact that 10 years have elapsed from the date of the incident and the further fact that appellants have already undergone 3 months imprisonment as per the sentence imposed on them, we think that ends of justice would be met if the sentence of imprisonment is reduced to the period already undergone besides imposing a fine of Rs. 5000 on each of the accused u/s 326 read with Section 34 I.P.C. We reduce the sentence as indicated above and direct that in default of payment of fine, the appellant concerned shall undergo simple imprisonment for a further period of three months. We also refrain from imposing any separate sentence on the other counts of offences. Out of the fine amount, if realised, a sum of Rs. 9,000 also be paid to the injured as compensation.

9. The Appeals stand disposed of accordingly.