



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 30.03.2016

CORAM:

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.N. PRAKASH

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.23429 of 2015

and

M.P. (MD) No.1 of 2015

1.P.Rajendran
2.K.Alamelu Mangai
3.R.Shobana
4.K.Mahesh
5.S.Alagar Raja
6.Bose
7.C.Selvaraj
8.G.Seetharaman
9.Parasuraman

... Petitioners / Accused 1 to 9

vs.

1. The State rep. By its
Inspector of Police
Devathanapatty Police Station
Theni District
(Cr.No.508 / 2015)

... 1st Respondent / Complainant

2.R.Andavar

... 2nd Respondent / De facto
Complainant

PRAYER: This petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records relating to the case in Crime No.508 of 2015, on the file of Devathanapatti Police Station and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.K.Gopalan

For Respondents : Mrs.S.Prabha,
G.A.(Crl.Side) for R1

Mr.T.Antony Arul Raj for R2

O R D E R

This petition has been filed seeking to quash the case registered in Crime No.508 of 2015, on the file of the first respondent, pursuant to the amicable settlement effected between the parties.



2. When the matter is taken up for hearing, the petitioners / accused 1 to 9 and the second respondent / de facto complainant, appeared in person and their identifications were also verified by this Court, in addition to the confirmation of the identity of the parties by the Government Advocate (Criminal Side) through the first respondent Police, namely, J.Ellankumaran, S.S.I., Devathanapatty Police Station, Theni District. Learned counsel appearing for the parties also endorsed the identify of their respective parties.

3. It is seen that betrothal for the marriage of the third petitioner / third accused with the second respondent / de facto complainant's son was held on 31.12.2014. Thereafter, the first petitioner / first accused contacted the second respondent / de facto complainant and informed that his family members are not interested in the marriage and therefore he wanted to stop the marriage. On the complaint lodged by the second respondent / de facto complainant, the first respondent Police registered a case, in Crime No.508 of 2015, under Sections 420, 294(b) and 506(i) I.P.C., on 10.10.2015.

4. The learned counsel appearing on either side filed a joint memo of compromise dated 11.03.2016, duly stating that since the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement by way of compromise among themselves, the second respondent has agreed to withdraw the above case in Crime No.508 of 2015, pending on the file of the first respondent Police.

5. When such a situation arose in similarly placed matters in Crl.O.P.(MD) Nos.406, 530 and 864 of 2016 (Prabu and others vs. State Rep. By The Inspector of Police and others), decided on 28.01.2016, this Court considered the various decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in this regard in several cases, namely, Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another [(2012) 10 SCC 303], B.S.Joshi vs. State of Haryana [(2003) 4 SCC 675], Nikhil Merchant vs. CBI [(2008) 9 SCC 677], Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another [(2014) 6 SCC 466] and State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Manish and others [(2015) 8 SCC 307] and observed as under:

"11. If the offences against women and children and the IPC offences falling under the categories, like, murder, attempt to murder, offence against unsound mind, rape, bribe, fabrication of documents, false evidence, robbery, dacoity, abduction, kidnapping, minor girl rape, idol theft, preventing a public servant from discharging of his/her duty, outrage of woman modesty, counterfeiting currency notes or bank notes, etc., are allowed to be compounded, it will surely have serious repercussion on the society, as the above



mentioned list is only illustrative and not exhaustive. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences clubbed with Special Enactment, like Arms Act, the Prevention of Corruption Act, TNPPDL Act, TNPID 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. As held by the Apex Court, insofar the offences arising out of matrimonial dispute, relating to dowry or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature, are concerned, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak, in case the parties resolve their entire disputes amicably among themselves. This Court feels that there cannot be any compromise in respect of the heinous and serious offences of mental depravity and in that case, the Court should be very slow in accepting the compromise. If the compromise is entertained mechanically by the Court, the accused will have the upper hand. The jurisdiction of this Court may not be allowed to be exploited by the accused, who can well afford to wait for a logical conclusion. The antecedents of the accused have also to be taken into consideration before accepting the memo of compromise and the accused, by means of compromise, cannot try to escape from the clutches of law."

6. Taking into account the above facts, judgments referred to supra, considering the nature of allegations and in view of joint memo of compromise dated 11.03.2016, the entire proceedings in Crime No.508 of 2015, on the file of the first respondent Police, in respect of all the accused, are hereby quashed.

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is allowed on the basis of the compromise entered into between the parties. The joint compromise memo, dated 11.03.2016, shall form part of this Order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AE)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

Encl:

<https://hccs.ecourts.gov.in/hccs/Services/Download/MemoCompromise-XeroxCopy>



To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Devathanapatty Police Station,
Theni District.

2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Ssl/krk

JM/GSV-PM/SAR-I/26.04.2016/4P-3C

CrI.O.P. (MD) No.23429 of 2015
and
M.P. (MD) No.1 of 2015
30.03.2016