



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 13.04.2016

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH**Crl.O.P.(MD) No.6353 of 2016**

WEB COPY

Raja ... Petitioner/Sole accused

-vs-

1. State
rep. by the Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Karaikudi, Sivagangai District
2. State. Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Karaikudi North Police Station,
Sivagangai District
3. Edal Queen ... 2nd Respondent/
Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure to call for the records relating to the First Information Report in Crime No.675 of 2015 dated 08.10.2015 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Karaikudi North Police Station, Sivagangai District and quash the same as against the petitioners.

For Petitioners	:	Mr.D.Rameshkumar
For R1 & R2	:	Mr.A.P.Balasubramani
		Government Advocate (Crl. side)
For R3	:	Mr.R.Vinoth

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking to quash the case registered in Crime No.675 of 2015 on the file of the 2nd respondent police, pursuant to the amicable settlement effected between the parties.

2. It is seen that a case in Crime No.675 of 2015 for the alleged offences under Sections IPC, has been registered against the petitioner/Accused.

3. When the matter is taken up for hearing, the petitioner/Accused and the 3rd respondent, 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, S.Selvam, Special Sub Inspector Police Station, Karaikudi



North Police Station, Sivaganga 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 29.03.2016, 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.675 of 2015 pending on the file of the 2nd 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.

WEB COPY

6. Taking note of the judgments referred to supra, considering the nature of allegations and in view of joint memo of compromise dated 29.03.2016, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served in keeping the matters pending. Therefore, the entire proceedings in Crime No.675 of 2015 on the file of the 2nd respondent in respect of the petitioner/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 29.03.2016 shall form part of this order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(Crl.Side)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

RR
To:

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Karaikudi, Sivagangai District
2. The Inspector of Police,
Karaikudi North Police Station,
Sivagangai District
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

RG.JGB-SS/ 10.05.2016 3P.4C

Encl:copy of Joint compromise memo

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.6353 of 2016
13.04.2016