



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 18TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD NAWAZ

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 12400 OF 2024

BETWEEN:

MR. PRAJWAL P A
S/O LATE ASHOK
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
No.68, PADUVANAHALLI VILLAGE,
NORANAKKI GATE,
HASSAN,
PINCODE- 573 201.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. H.S GAURAV, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. RANGANATH REDDY R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE BY
GOVINDARAJANAGAR POLICE STATION,
BANGALORE,
REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
BENGALURU,
PIN CODE - 560001.

2. RANJITHA H. N.
D/O NINGAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS,
R/A #2, 2ND MAIN ROAD, HUCCHAPPA LAYOUT,
MUDALAPALYA, BANGALORE,
PIN CODE - 560072.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ANOOP KUMAR M. V., HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. KODANDARAMEGOWDA., ADVOCATE FOR R2)



THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S 482 CR.PC (FILED U/S 528 BNSS) PRAYING QUASH THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE PETITIONER REGISTERED IN CR.NO.188/2024 AGAINST THE PETITIONER REGISTERED BY GOVINDARAJANAGARA POLICE STATION BEFORE THE LXX ADDL. CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE AND SPECIAL JUDGE AT BENGALURU AND THE SAME IS CHARGE SHEETED AND PENDING AS SPL.C.NO.1454/2024 FOR THE OFFENCE P/U/S 417, 420, 376, 34 OF IPC AND 3(2)(v), 3(1)(w)(i)(ii), 3(1)(r)(s) OF SC AND ST (POA) ACT, 1989.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD NAWAZ

ORAL ORDER

Petitioner is the sole accused charge sheeted in connection with Crime No.188/2024 of Govindaraja Nagar Police Station. Initially FIR was registered against accused Nso.1 to 6. While filing charge sheet, names of accused Nos.2 to 6 were deleted. Charge sheet is filed for the offence Punishable under Section 420, 417, 376 read with 34 of IPC and Section 3(2)(v), 3(1)(w)(i)(ii), 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC/ST (POA) Act, 1989.

2. It is the case of prosecution that respondent No.2 / victim belongs to SC category and the petitioner is



a Vokkaliga. Both of them were in love with each other for 8 years. Petitioner with a promise of marriage, developed physical relationship with the victim and also received a sum of Rs.7,80,305/-, from her and later refused to marry and cheated her etc.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner and respondent No.2 submits that the matter has been settled and the petitioner and respondent No.2 are now married and they have a child. It is submitted that in view of the settlement, respondent No.2 is not interested in proceedings with the case any further.

4. An application is filed under Section 482 read with Section 320 of Cr.P.C, signed by the petitioner and respondent No.2, seeking to quash the proceedings on the ground of settlement. The application is supported by the joint affidavit of the parties. Joint affidavit is placed on record, contents are extracted here under:-

1. *That the above Criminal Petition is filed seeking quashing of the FIR, complaint, charge sheet and all further proceedings in Crime No.188/2024, pending as Spl.C. No.1454/2024 on*



the file of the LXX Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge and Special Judge, Bengaluru.

- 2. That during the pendency of the proceedings, the Petitioner and Respondent No.2 have amicably settled all their disputes with the intervention of elders and well-wishers.*
- 3. That pursuant to the settlement, the Petitioner and Respondent No.2 have solemnized their marriage on **24.11.2025** and are presently living together as husband and wife peacefully.*
- 4. That Respondent No.2 has sworn to a Joint Affidavit stating that she has no objection for quashing of the FIR, charge sheet and all further proceedings and that she does not wish to prosecute the case any further.*
- 5. That though the offences alleged are non-compoundable in nature, this Hon'ble Court, in exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, is empowered to quash the criminal proceedings in appropriate cases to secure the ends of justice.*
- 6. That the dispute between the parties is purely personal in nature and continuation of the criminal proceedings, despite the settlement and marriage, would serve no useful purpose.*
- 7. That in view of the settlement, marriage and the unwillingness of the complainant to support the prosecution case, continuation of the criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of process of law and would seriously affect the matrimonial life of the parties.*

5. Along with the application, a copy of the marriage registration certificate is also enclosed. Certificate shows that the marriage between the petitioner and respondent No.2 was solemnized on 13.11.2025 and registered on 24.11.2025.



6. Petitioner and respondent No.2 are present before the Court. They submit that they are now married and living peacefully and leading a harmonious life along with their child.

7. Offences alleged are non compoundable in nature. However, the parties have resolved the dispute and filed an application seeking to quash the proceedings on the ground of settlement.

8. At this juncture it is useful to refer to paragraph Nos.9 and 10 of the judgment of the Apex Court in ***Ramawatar v. State of Madhya Pradesh*** reported in ***(2022) 13 SCC 635***.

"9. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties at some length, we are of the opinion that two questions fall for our consideration in the present appeal. First, whether the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution can be invoked for quashing of criminal proceedings arising out of a "non-compoundable" offence? If yes, then whether the power to quash proceedings can be extended to offences arising out of special statutes such as the SC/ST Act?

10. So far as the first question is concerned, it would be *ad rem* to outrightly refer to the recent decision of this



Court in Ramgopal v. State of M.P. (2022) 14 SCC 531 : 2021 SCC Online SC 834, wherein, a two-Judge Bench of this Court consisting of two of us (N.V. Ramana, CJI & Surya Kant, J.) was confronted with an identical question. Answering in the affirmative, it has been clarified that the jurisdiction of a court under Section 320 CrPC cannot be construed as a proscription against the invocation of inherent powers vested in this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution nor on the powers of the High Courts under Section 482 CrPC. It was further held that the touchstone for exercising the extraordinary powers under Article 142 or Section 482 CrPC, would be to do complete justice. Therefore, this Court or the High Court, as the case may be, after having given due regard to the nature of the offence and the fact that the victim/complainant has willingly entered into a settlement/compromise, can quash proceedings in exercise of their respective constitutional/inherent powers."

9. It is also useful to refer to para 7 of the judgment in ***Madhukar and others v. State of Maharashtra and another*** arising out of SLP(Crl.) No.7212/2025

"7. In the present matter, we are confronted with an unusual situation where the FIR invoking serious charges, including Section 376 IPC, was filed immediately following an earlier FIR lodged by the opposing side. This sequence of events lends a certain context to the allegations and suggests that the second FIR may have been a reactionary step. More importantly, the complainant in the second FIR has



unequivocally expressed her desire not to pursue the case. She has submitted that she is now married, settled in her personal life, and continuing with the criminal proceedings would only disturb her peace and stability. Her stand is neither tentative nor ambiguous, she has consistently maintained, including through an affidavit on record, that she does not support the prosecution and wants the matter to end. The parties have also amicably resolved their differences and arrived at a mutual understanding. In these circumstances, the continuation of the trial would not serve any meaningful purpose. It would only prolong distress for all concerned, especially the complainant, and burden the Courts without the likelihood of a productive outcome."

10. In light of the above judgments of the Apex Court and in the facts and circumstances of the present case and keeping in view that no purpose will be served in continuing the proceedings against the petitioner, it is just and proper to quash the proceedings. Continuation of the proceedings will only prolong the distress for the parties, especially the victim, as the parties are now happily married. Hence, the following:-



ORDER

i) Application is allowed, consequently, petition is ***allowed.***

ii) Entire proceedings against the petitioner in Spl.C.No.1454/2024 pending before the LXX Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, and Special Judge, Bengaluru for the offence Punishable under Section 417, 420, 376 read with Section 34 of IPC, Section 3(2)(v), 3(1)(w)(i)(ii), 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC/ST (POA) Act, 1989, are ***quashed.***

**Sd/-
(MOHAMMAD NAWAZ)
JUDGE**