



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 21ST DAY OF MAY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 7250 OF 2026 (482(Cr.PC) /

528(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. NARASIMHARAJU B H @
NARASIMHAMURTHY
S/O HULLURIAH @
CHIKKAHULLURIAH
NOW AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @
POST KASABA HOBLI, NELAMANGALA TALUK
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT PIN-562123
2. NAGARAJU.C @ NAGARAJU
S/O CHANNAPPA
NOW AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @ POST
KASABA HOBLI
NELAMANGALA TALUK
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT PIN-562123
3. NAVEENKUMAR.B.G @ NAVEENKUMAR
S/O GANGANARASIAH
NOW AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @ POST
KASABA HOBLI, NELAMANGALA TALUK
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT
PIN-562123
4. GEETHALAKSHMI @ GEETHAMMA



W/O LATE RAJANNA
NOW AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @ POST
KASABA HOBLI, NELAMANGALA TQ,
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT PIN-562123

AND ALSO R/AT TARABANAHALLI VILLAGE
DODDA BELAVANGAL HOBLI
DODDABALALPURA TALUK
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT PIN-561204

5. RATHNAMMA
W/O LINGAPPA @ LINGAIAH
NOW AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @ POST
KASABA HOBLI
NELAMANGALA TALUK
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT PIN-562123

AND ALSO R/AT # 328
10TH A MAIN ROAD
5TH BLOCK , RAJAJINAGAR
BENGALORE CENTRAL
SRIRAMPURM
BENGALORE PIN-560021

6. CHANDRASHEKARA.B.R @ CHANDRASHEKARA
S/O LATE RAJANNA
NOW AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @ POST
KASABA HOBLI
NELAMANGALA TALUK
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT
PIN-562123

AND ALSO R/AT TARABANAHALLI VILLAGE
DODDA BELAVANGAL HOBLI
DODDABALALPURA TALUK
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT, PIN-561204

7. JAGADISH



S/O LATE LINGAPPA @ LINGAIAH
NOW AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @ POST
KASABA HOBLI, NELAMANGALA TQ.
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT PIN-562123

AND ASLO R/AT # 328
10TH A MAIN
5TH BLOCK
NEAR ROTARY EYE HOSPITAL
BHUVANESHWARINAGAR
RAJAJINAGAR
BENGALORE. PIN-560021

8. NARASIMHAMURTHY
S/O RANGAIAH @ DODDARANGAIAH
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @ POST
KASABA HOBLI
NELAMANGALA TALUK
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT PIN-562123

9. NARASIMHAMURTHY @ MURTHY
S/O CHANNAPA
NOW AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @ POST
KASABA HOBLI
NELAMANGALA TALUK
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT PIN-562123

10. GANGAMALLAIAH
S/O LATE HULLARIVEAIA
NOW AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @ POST
KASABA HOBLI,
NELAMANGALA TQ,
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT PIN-562123

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SUNIL K. N., ADVOCATE)



AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY NELAMANGALA
RURAL POLICE STATION
AT NELAMANGALA PIN-562123

REPRESENTED BY THE STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
BENGALORE PIN-560001

2. SRI.MANUKUMAR.B.T
S/O LATE THIMMAIAH
NOW AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
R/AT T.BEGUR VILLAGE @ POST
KASABA HOBLI,
NELAMANGALA TQ,
BENGALORE RURAL DISTRICT PIN-562123

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. M.M. WAHEEDA, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. PAWAN KUMAR S., ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 482 CR.P.C (U/S 528 BNSS) PRAYING TO QUASH THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS IN CC.NO.658/2016 ARISING OUT OF CR.NO.98/2016 REGISTERED BY THE 1st RESPONDENT POLICE IN NELAMANGALA POLICE AGAINST THE PETITIONER, PENDING BEFORE THE PRL. CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC, AT NELAMANGALA, FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/S 143,147,323,324,504,354(B),506,149 OF IPC, ON THE COMPLAINT BY THE FATHER OF THE 2nd RESPONDENT IN SO FAR AS PETITIONERS ARE CONCERNED

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



ORAL ORDER

Heard Sri. Sunil K.N., learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, Smt. M.M. Waheeda, learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for respondent No.1, and Sri. Pawan Kumar S., learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2.

2. This petition is filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of the proceedings in C.C. No.658/2016 arising out of Crime No.98/2016 registered by Nelamangala Police Station, pending on the file of the Principal Civil Judge and JMFC, Nelamangala, for the offences punishable under Sections 143, 147, 323, 324, 504, 354B, 506 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code.

2.1 I.A. No.2/2026 is filed under Sections 320 and 320(4)(b) read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure praying to record the compromise entered into between the petitioners and respondent No.2, to permit compounding of the offences, and consequently to quash the impugned proceedings.



2.2 The application is accompanied by the verifying affidavits of all the parties. A joint memo dated 19.05.2026 has also been filed by the respective parties along with the application. The joint memo discloses that, at the intervention of the elders of both sides, the parties have resolved their differences and amicably settled the dispute in order to maintain peace and cordial relationship. It is further stated that the civil dispute in O.S. No.390/2018 pending on the file of the I Additional Senior Civil Judge and JMFC, Nelamangala, which was the genesis of the present criminal proceedings, has also been settled.

3. It is submitted that accused No.1 is no more. Accused Nos.2 to 12 and respondent No.2 are present before the Court. Respondent No.2 is victim No.3. It is further submitted that victim Nos.1 and 2 are also no more. When queried by the Court, the petitioners and respondent No.2 jointly submitted that they have amicably settled the dispute and are not intending to pursue the above criminal proceedings, as the main civil dispute between the parties has already been settled. The parties further jointly submitted that they have understood



the contents of the application, the affidavits, and the joint memo.

4. The said submission is placed on record.

5. The joint memo reads as follows:

"1. It is submitted that on the complaint of the father of the respondent No.2, 1st respondent police have registered a case in Crime. No.98/2016 on 06/03/2026 for the offences punishable under sections 143, 147, 148, 323, 324, 504, 506 R/w 34 of IPC and thereafter the first respondent Police have filed a charge sheet against the petitioners for the offence punishable u/s143, 147, 148, 323, 324, 504, 354(b), 506 R/w 34 of IPC it was numbered as C.C.No.658/2016 on the file of Hon'ble Prl. Civil Judge and JMFC at Nelamangala

2. It is submitted that at the intervention of the elders of both sides have reconciled all the differences between the parties and compromised the aforesaid disputes in order to bring the peace between the parties. Accordingly the petitioner No.4, 5, 6 and 7 and another and the 2nd respondent have compromised their dispute in O.S. No. 390/2018 on the file of 1 Addl. Senior Civil Judge & J.M.F.C. at Nelamangala and they by settling all disputes relating to properties as well as the criminal cases, pursuant to the said compromise, Original Suit No.390/2018 was disposed of by the Court of the 1 Additional Senior Civil Judge and JMFC at Nelamangala and the petitioners are bound by, shall faithfully abide by the terms and conditions of the compromise petition as well as the said Decree passed by the Hon'ble Court and shall extend full cooperation to Respondent No.2 in terms thereof Hence for the said reason, deserves to be quashed by the hands of this Hon'ble Court.

3. In view of the settlement arrived at, the 2nd respondent/Victim No.3 has no wish to continue the criminal proceedings initiated by her and he has no objection for quashing the proceedings against all the petitioners. Since the



alleged offences are punishable under section U/s sec143, 147, 323, 324, 504, 354(B), 506, 149 R/w 34 of IPC which are non-compoundable, without permission of the court, this application is filed seeking permission to compound the above said offences.

4. The petitioners and the complainant / respondent no.2 have understood the contents of this application and out of their free will, volition and without any fear, force, threat, or coercion, have affixed their signatures to this application."

6. On perusal of the joint memo and the nature of the alleged offences, it is seen that, except the offence punishable under Section 354B of the IPC, all other offences are compoundable as provided under Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

6.1 The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Another*** , reported in ***(2012) 10 SCC 303*** ,has held that the power of the High Court to quash criminal proceedings in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power conferred upon a criminal court to compound offences under Section 320 of the Code. It is further held that the inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation, but the same has to be exercised in accordance with the guidelines engrafted in such power,



namely: (i) to secure the ends of justice; or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court.

6.2 It is further held that compounding is permissible in criminal cases having an overwhelmingly and predominantly civil flavour, arising out of civil disputes or family disputes, where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved the entire dispute amicably. It is observed that, in such circumstances, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if, in its view, because of the compromise arrived at between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak, and continuation of the criminal proceedings would result in great oppression and prejudice to the accused. It is further held that extreme injustice would be caused if the criminal proceedings are not quashed despite a full and complete settlement between the parties.

6.3 For the sake of convenience, the relevant paragraph is extracted hereunder:



HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:25244
CRL.P No. 7250 of 2026

" 61. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz.: (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or FIR may be exercised where the offender and the victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc.; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and



complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding."

7. In the light of the above circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the dispute between the parties has arisen out of a civil dispute among the family members. This Court finds no impediment in accepting the joint memo and permitting compounding of the alleged offences.

8. In the light of the above, the following order is passed:

ORDER

- (i) The Criminal petition is ***allowed***.
- (ii) The proceedings in C.C. No.658/2016 arising out of Crime No.98/2016 for the offences punishable under Sections 143, 147, 323, 324, 504, 354B, 506 read with Section 149 of the IPC, pending on the



**NC: 2026:KHC:25244
CRL.P No. 7250 of 2026**

file of the Principal Civil Judge and JMFC,
Nelamangala, are hereby ***quashed***.

**SD/-
(K. V. ARAVIND)
JUDGE**

VBS
List No.: 1 SI No.: 47