

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE U.DURGA PRASAD RAO

Crl.P.M.P.No. 5394 of 2015 in Crl.P.No. 5344 of 2015

and

Crl.P.No. 5344 of 2015

-

Common Order:

The de-facto complainant Ms. Tallapally Latha and her counsel Sri M.Srinivas Reddy are present. Accused and their counsel Sri S. Sridhar are present.

2. Heard both sides.

3. On the report given by the de-facto complainant, the Police of P.S. Osmania University, Hyderabad registered a case in Crime No. 51 of 2012 and after investigation laid charge sheet against accused for the offences under Section 3(1) (v) (x) of SC & ST (POA) Act, 1989, under Sections 406, 420 & 506 IPC and under Section 3(5)(a) of AP (TA) ML Act and the charge sheet is taken on file and registered as Special S.C.No. 17 of 2014 on the file of VI Additional Sessions Judge, Secunderabad.

4 . The allegations briefly are that the complainant for the construction of second floor has approached Dhanalaxmi Cooperative Society represented by Mr. Balraj who lent money on the mortgage of some of the flats of the complainant and her husband and later disputes arose between them. A1 is the son of said Balraj and all other accused are employees in Dhanalaxmi Cooperative Society. It is alleged that when the complainant and her husband questioned A1 regarding flats, he along with other accused beat the husband of the de-facto complainant and abused them by their caste.

5. While so, today the de-facto complainant and the accused along with their counsels present and submitted that at the intervention of elders, both the parties have amicably settled the property disputes and in fact she has no objection for quashment of proceedings against them in S.C.No. 17 of 2014 on the file of VI Additional Sessions Judge, Secunderabad and therefore, the Court may be pleased to accord permission to them to compound the offence and

quash the proceedings in the interest of justice.

6. In view of the above submission and having regard to the fact that the case is essentially of civil nature involving mortgage contract and as the parties amicably settled the disputes between them and also considering that no useful purpose will be served even if they are driven to trial since they compromised and following the decision reported in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another*** (2012) 10 SCC 303) compromise is recorded in terms of accompanying compromise petition and consequently the proceedings in SC No. 17 of 2014 on the file of VI Additional Sessions Judge, Secunderabad are quashed as per the joint compromise memo filed by the parties.

7. In the result, both the petitions are accordingly allowed.

8. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

U.DURGA PRASAD RAO, J

Date: 22.04.2015

KA