

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE B.KEMAL PASHA

MONDAY, THE 12TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2015/20TH ASWINA, 1937

Crl.MC.No. 6343 of 2015  
-----

S.C.NO.966/2012 OF ASSISTANT SESSIONS COURT, NEDUMANGAD  
-----

PETITIONER(S)/ACCUSED 1 TO 6 :  
-----

1. BINEESH, AGED 27 YEARS,  
S/O.BALU, VINEESH HOUSE, KOLLIYAKKONAM,  
PANACHAMOODU, KARIPPUR, NEDUMANGAD.
2. SUJITH, AGED 32 YEARS,  
S/O.GOPINATHAN, THEKKUMKARAMURI, VAND,  
PANACHAMOODU, KARUPPUR.
3. SUDHEESH@SUDHI, AGED 23 YEARS,  
S/O.SASI, SUDHEESH BHAVAN, VADAKKUMKARA,  
CHARUVALLY, KARUPPUR.
4. UNNI, AGED 26 YEARS,  
S/O.KITHU, PARAPPIL VEEDU, KOLLIYAKONAMCHIRA,  
VADAKKUMKARA, KARUPPUR.
5. ANEESH, AGED 24 YEARS,  
S/O.BALU, VINEESH HOUSE, KOLLIYAKKONAM,  
PANACHAMOODU, KARIPPUR, NEDUMANGAD.
6. SHAJIMON, AGED 32 YEARS,  
S/O.GOPINATHAN, SUJITH BHAVAN, THEKKUMKARAMURI,  
VANDA, PANACHAMOODU, KARUPPUR.

BY ADV. SRI.K.NIRMALAN

RESPONDENT(S)/STATE AND THE INJURED :  
-----

1. STATE OF KERALA,  
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,  
HIGH COURT OF KERALA.

**Crl.MC.No. 6343 of 2015**  
-----

**2. PRASANTH, AGED 34 YEARS,  
S/O.SURENDRAN, SUNIL BHAVAN, KOLLIKONAM,  
PANACHAMOODU, KARUPPUR.**

**R1 BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SMT.MAYA  
R2 BY ADV. SRI.A.RAJASIMHAN**

**THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION  
ON 12-10-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE  
FOLLOWING:**

Msd.

**APPENDIX**

**PETITIONER(S)' ANNEXURES :**

**ANNEXURE A1: CERTIFIED COPY OF THE FINAL REPORT IN  
S.C.NO.966/2012 PENDING BEFORE THE ASSISTANT  
SESSIONS COURT, NEDUMANGAD.**

**RESPONDENT(S)' ANNEXURES :**

**NIL**

**//TRUE COPY//**

**P.A.TO JUDGE.**

Msd.

**B. KEMAL PASHA, J.**

.....  
Crl.M.C. No.6343 of 2015 E  
.....

*Dated this the 12<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2015*

**O R D E R**

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Petitioners are the accused in Sessions Case No.966/2012 of the Assistant Sessions Court, Nedumangad for the offences punishable under Sections 143, 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324 and 308 read with Section 149 IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

2. According to the learned counsel for the petitioners, the matter has been amicably settled between them and the de facto complainant, the injured. Considering the seriousness of the allegations against the petitioners, this Court is of the view that the settlement arrived at between the parties cannot be accepted and endorsed by this Court. Of course, the settlement arrived at

between the parties can be brought to the notice of the court below, so that the court below can take the case out of turn and dispose it of expeditiously.

With the said observations, this CrI.M.C. is dismissed.

Sd/-  
**(B.KEMAL PASHA, JUDGE)**

aks/12/10

*// True Copy //*

*PA to Judge*