

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY

Crl.P.M.P.No.11888 of 2015

AND

CRIMINAL PETITION No.11940 of 2015

-

COMMON ORDER:

This criminal petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.PC to quash the proceedings against the petitioner/A1 in C.C. No.277 of 2012 on the file of VII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad.

2. Crl.P.M.P.No.11888 of 2015 is filed to permit second respondent—*de facto* complainant to compromise the matter with the petitioner/A1.

3. The petitioner and the second respondent are present. Mr.P.Vamsheedhar Reddy, learned counsel identified the petitioner. Mr.R.Venkat Rao, learned Advocate representing Mr.C.Sai Vishnu, learned counsel, identified second respondent.

4. The second respondent in the open court submitted that she voluntarily entered into compromise with the petitioner at the advice of the elders. She further submitted that nobody compelled or forced him to enter into compromise with the petitioner. The offences under Sections 448 and 506 IPC are compoundable without permission of the court.

5. In **Gian Singh v State of Punjab**, the apex Court observed as under:

“..... In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put 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 wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

6. Taking into consideration the factum of settlement arrived at between the parties,

this court is of the view that even if the proceedings are allowed to continue, the second respondent may not support the case of the prosecution. No purpose will be served in keeping the matter pending in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

7. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated in the cases cited supra, I am of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to quash the proceedings.

8. In the result, CrI.P.M.P.No.11888 of 2015 is ordered. Consequently, the criminal petition is allowed, quashing the proceedings against the petitioner/A1 in C.C. No.277 of 2012 on the file of VII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad. Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending in the criminal petition, shall stand closed.

T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J.

November 24, 2015.

YS