



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 24.02.2016

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.3246 of 2016

Sasi ... Petitioner/A6

-vs-

1. State of Tamil Nadu
The Inspector of Police,
Thuckalay Police Station,
Kanyakumari District.
(Crime No.126/2012) ... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. Stephen Selvin ... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure to call for the records in C.C.No.400 of 2012 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Padmanabhapuram and quash the same in so far as the petitioner is concerned.


For Petitioners	:	Mr.R.J.Karthick
For R1	:	Mrs.S.Prabha
		Government Advocate(Crl.side)
For R2	:	Mr.P.T.Ramesh Raja

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking to quash the proceedings in C.C.No. 400 of 2012 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Padmanabhapuram, pursuant to the amicable settlement effected between the parties.

2. It is seen that a case in Crime No.126 of 2012 for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 452, 294(b), 427 and 506 (ii) IPC has been registered against the petitioner / A6. After completion of investigation, the first respondent police filed a charge sheet and the same was taken on file in C.C.No.400 of 2012 before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Padmanabhapuram.

3. When the matter is taken up for hearing, the petitioner and the second respondent, 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 (Crl.side) through the respondent Police, namely, P.L.Chirthuraj, Special Sub-Inspector of Police, Thackalay Police Station. 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 16.02.2016, 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 proceedings in C.C.No.400 of 2012 before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Padmanabhapuram.

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 memo of compromise dated 16.02.2016, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served in keeping the matters pending. Therefore, the entire proceedings in C.C.No.400 of 2012 before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Padmanabhapuram in respect of the petitioner/A6 alone, 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 16.02.2016 shall form part of this order.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To:

- 1.The Inspector of Police,Thuckalay Police Station,
Kanyakumari District.
- 2.The Judicial Magistrate, Padmanabhapuram.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

+1cc to Mr.R.J.Karthick,Advocate Sr.No.10735

cm

AA/NGM-SS/02.03.2016/3p-5c

Cr1.O.P. (MD) No.3246 of 2016
24.02.2016