



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED 02.02.2016
CORAM
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH
Crl.OP Nos.1826 and 1827 of 2016

WEB COPY

In Crl.O.P. (MD) No.1826 of 2016:

Kannan

...Petitioner/Sole Acused

Vs.

1.State rep. By
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Thalaiyuthu Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(In Crime No.381 of 2015)

..1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Thalavai

.. 2nd Respondent/Defacto
Complainant

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records pertaining to the First Information Report in Crime No.381 of 2015 dated 23.12.2015 registered by the first respondent/complainant and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner	:Mr.M.Maran
For R1	:Mrs.S.Prabha Government Advocate (Crl.side)
For R2	: Mr.R.Rajesh Kumar

In Crl.O.P. (MD) No.1827 of 2016:

1.Thalavai
2.Kangaraja
3.Maruthupandi

... Petitioners/A1 to A3

Vs.

1.State rep. By
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Thalaiyuthu Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(In Crime No.382 of 2015)

..1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Kannan

.. 2nd Respondent/Defacto
Complainant

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records pertaining to the First Information Report in Crime No.382 of 2015 dated 23.12.2015 registered by the first respondent/complainant and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner	:Mr.R.Rajesh Kumar
For R1	:Mrs.S.Prabha Government Advocate (Crl.side)
For R2	:Mr.M.Maran

**C O M M O N O R D E R**

These petitions have been filed seeking to quash the cases registered in Crime Nos.381 and 382 of 2015 on the file of the 1st respondent police, pursuant to the amicable settlement effected between the parties.

2. It is seen that a case in Crime No.381 of 2015 for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) IPC, has been registered against the petitioner in Crl.O.P.(MD) No.1826 of 2016/ Sole Accused and a case in Crime No.382 of 2015 for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 294(b), 323 and 506(ii) IPC, has been registered against the petitioners in Crl.O.P.(MD) No.1827 of 2016/A1 to A3.

3. When the matters are taken up for hearing, the petitioners/Accused and the second respondents, 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 through the respondent Police. Learned counsel appearing for the parties also endorsed the identify of their respective parties.

4. The counsel appearing on either side filed joint memos of compromise dated 28.01.2016, duly stating that since the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement by way of compromise among themselves, the second respondent in respective case has agreed to withdraw the above cases in Crime Nos.381 and 382 of 2015 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, 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 memos of compromise dated 28.01.2016, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served in keeping the matters pending. Therefore, the entire proceedings in Crime Nos.381 and 382 of 2015 on the file of the first respondent in respect of the petitioners/accused alone, are hereby quashed.

Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petitions are allowed on the basis of the compromise entered into between the parties. The joint compromise memos dated 28.01.2016 shall form part of this order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CO.Dept) I/c

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

Encl.: Xerox copy of The Joint Memor of Compromise.

To

- 1.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Thalaiyuthu Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

Cr1.OP Nos.1826 and 1827 of 2016
02.02.2016

CM

SH/PM-MP:24.02.2016:3P/3C