



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 28.03.2016

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASHCrl.O.P.(MD) No.24307 of 2015

1. P.Ganesan
2. Poopandi @ Kala
- 3.V.Balakrishnan
- 4.K.Manivannan
- 5.S.Muniasamy
- 6.T.Ramasamy Gounder

... Petitioners/
A1 to A6

-vs-

1. State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Oomachikulam Police Station,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.495/2013)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. A.Ramu Ammal
- ... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure to call for the records relating to Crime No.495 of 2013 dated 15.07.2013, on the file of the Inspector of Police, Oomachikulam Police Station, Madurai District and quash the same as against the petitioners.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Mahendrapathy

For R1 : Mr.K.V.Rajarajan
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

For R2 : Mr.D.Rameshkumar

O R D E R

This petition has been filed seeking to quash the case registered in Crime No.495 of 2013 on the file of the 1st respondent police, pursuant to the amicable settlement effected between the parties.

<https://hcservices.courts.gov.in/hcservices> It is seen that a case in Crime No.495 of 2013 for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 294(b), 406, 420 and 506(i) IPC, has been registered against the petitioners / A1 to A6.



3. When the matter is taken up for hearing, the petitioners/Accused and the second respondents, appeared in persons and their identifications were also verified by this Court, in addition to the confirmation of the identity of the parties by the Government Advocate (Crl. Side) through the respondent Police, namely, Arjunan, Sub-Inspector of Police, Oomachikulam Police Station, Madurai District. Learned counsel appearing for the parties also endorsed the identify of their respective parties.

4. The counsel appearing on either side filed a joint memo of compromise dated Nil of August 2015, 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.495 of 2013 pending on the file of the first respondent.

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 and those 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 note of the judgments referred to supra, considering the nature of allegations and in view of joint memo of compromise dated Nil of August 2015, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served in keeping the matters pending. Therefore, the entire proceedings in Crime No.495 of 2013 on the file of the first respondent in respect of the petitioners/accused, are hereby quashed.

Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed on the basis of the compromise entered into between the parties. The joint compromise memos dated Nil of August 2015 shall form part of this order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(P&A)

/True Copy/

Sub-Assistant Registrar

To:

(*)JOINT COMPROMISE MEMO XEROX COPIES ARE ENCLOSED HEREWITH

1. The Inspector of Police,
Oomachikulam Police Station,
Madurai District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+One cc to Mr.S.Mahendrapathy, Advocate, SR.No.17541

RR

RL/4C/2P/AN/MP/SARI/7/4/2016

Cr1.O.P. (MD)No.24307 of 2015

28/03/2016