

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY
Crl.P.M.P.Nos.1338 & 1339 of 2016
AND
CRIMINAL PETITION No.1411 of 2016

-

COMMON ORDER:

1 This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.PC to quash the proceedings against the petitioners/A.1 to A.4 in Cr.No.187 of 2015 on the file of Station House Officer, Women Police Station, Begumpet, Hyderabad, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 420, 406 and 506 r/w 34 of IPC and Sections 3, 4 and 6 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

2. Crl.P.M.P.Nos.1338 and 1339 of 2016 are filed to permit second respondent—*de facto* complainant to compromise the matter with the petitioners.

3. The petitioner No.3 filed General Power of Attorney seeking permission of the Court to represent the petitioner No.4. Petitioner Nos.1 to 3 and the 2nd respondent are present. Sri S.Rohit Ram, learned counsel identified the petitioners. Sri K.Ravinder Reddy, learned counsel identified the second respondent.

4. The second respondent in the open Court submitted that she voluntarily entered into compromise with the petitioners at the advice of the elders. She further submitted that nobody compelled or forced her to enter into compromise with the petitioners. The offence under Sections 498-A 420 and 406 of IPC are compoundable with the

permission of the Court whereas the offence under sections 3, 4 and 6 of Dowry Prohibition Act are non-compoundable.

5. In **Shiji alias Pappu v Radhika**^[1], the Supreme Court held as under:

“It is manifest that simply because an offence is not compoundable under Section 320 CrPC is by itself no reason for the High Court to refuse exercise of its power under Section 482 CrPC. That power can in our opinion be exercised in cases where there is no chance of recording a conviction against the accused and the entire exercise of a trial is destined to be an exercise in futility. There is a subtle distinction between compounding of offences by the parties before the trial court or in appeal on the one hand and the exercise of power by the High Court to quash the prosecution under Section 482 CrPC on the other. While a court trying an accused or hearing an appeal against conviction, may not be competent to permit compounding of an offence based on a settlement arrived at between the parties in cases where the offences are not compoundable under Section 320, the High Court may quash the prosecution even in cases where the offences with which the accused stand charged are non-compoundable. The inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 CrPC are not for that purpose controlled by Section 320 CrPC.”

6. In **Gian Singh v State of Punjab**^[2], the apex Court observed as under:

“..... In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and

prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

7. Taking into consideration the factum of settlement arrived at between the parties, this Court is of the view that even if the proceedings are allowed to continue, the second respondent may not support the case of the prosecution. No purpose will be served in keeping the matter pending in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

8. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated in the cases cited supra, I am of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to quash the proceedings.

9. In the result, CrI.P.M.P.Nos.1338 and 1339 of 2016 are ordered. Consequently, the criminal petition is allowed, quashing the proceedings against the petitioners/A.1 to A.4 in Cr.No.187 of 2015 on the file of Station House Officer, Women Police Station, Begumpet, Hyderabad. Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending in the criminal

petition, shall stand closed.

T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J.

Date: 5th February, 2016

Kvsn

[\[1\]](#) (2011) 10 SCC 705

[\[2\]](#) (2012) 10 SCC 303