

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY

Crl.P.M.P.Nos.11537 & 11538 of 2015 IN CRL.P.No.11501 OF 2015

AND

CRIMINAL PETITION No.11830 OF 2015

-

COMMON ORDER:

1 These two criminal petitions are filed under Section 482 of Cr.PC to quash the proceedings against the petitioners/accused No.1, 3 to 7 in C.C.No.1093 of 2013 on the file of the Court of the XIX Metropolitan Magistrate at Miyapur, Kukatpally, R.R.District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A of IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

2 Crl.P.M.P.Nos.11537 & 11538 of 2015 are filed to permit second respondent—*de facto* complainant to compromise the matter with the petitioners/accused No.1, 3 to 7.

3 The petitioners and the second respondent are present. Sri J.C. Francis, learned counsel identified the petitioners. Mr. A.Venkatesam learned counsel identified the second respondent. It is represented that the first petitioner in Crl.P.No.11830 of 2015 by name Muvva Ranganayakamma is bedridden and she is represented by her son Muvva Satyanarayana who is petitioner in Crl.P.No.11501 of 2015. To that effect, said Muvva Satyanarayana the sole petitioner in Crl.P.No.11501 of 2015 filed GPA on her behalf.

4 The second respondent in both the petitions submitted that she voluntarily entered into compromise with the petitioners at the advice of the elders. She further submitted that nobody compelled or forced her to enter into compromise with the petitioners. The offence under Section 498-A of IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act are non—compoundable.

5 In **Shiji alias Pappu v Radhika**, the Supreme Court held as under:

“It is manifest that simply because an offence is not compoundable under Section 320 CrPC is by itself no reason for the High Court to refuse exercise of its power under Section 482 CrPC. That power can in our opinion be exercised in cases where there is no chance of recording a conviction against the accused and the entire exercise of a trial is destined to be an exercise in futility. There is a subtle distinction between compounding of offences by the parties before the trial court or in appeal on the one hand and the exercise of

power by the High Court to quash the prosecution under Section 482 CrPC on the other. While a court trying an accused or hearing an appeal against conviction, may not be competent to permit compounding of an offence based on a settlement arrived at between the parties in cases where the offences are not compoundable under Section 320, the High Court may quash the prosecution even in cases where the offences with which the accused stand charged are non-compoundable. The inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 CrPC are not for that purpose controlled by Section 320 CrPC.”

6 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.”

7 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.

8 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.

9 In the result, CrI.P.M.P.Nos.11537 & 11538 of 2015 are ordered. Consequently, the criminal petitions are allowed, quashing the proceedings so far as the petitioners/accused No.1, 3 to 7 are concerned in C.C.No.1093 of 2013 on the file of the Court of the XIX Metropolitan Magistrate at Miyapur, Kukatpally, R.R.District. Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending in these Criminal Petitions, shall stand closed.

T. SUNIL CHOWDARY, J

Date: 17th November, 2015

Kvsn