

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M. SATYANARAYANA MURTHY

Crl.P.MP.No.18510 of 2016

in/and

Crl.P.No.16385 of 2016

ORDER:

Criminal Petition No.16385 of 2016 is filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('Cr.P.C.' for brevity) to quash the proceedings in Crime No.123 of 2015 on the file of the Women Police Station, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A and 354-B of I.P.C.

2. Crl.P.MP.No.18510 of 2016 is filed under Section 320 of Cr.P.C. by the petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 6 and the 2nd respondent/de facto complainant seeking to record the compromise and consequently quash the entire proceedings in the aforesaid C.C., in view of the compromise entered into between the petitioners and the 2nd respondent.

3. Both the parties are present in person and they are identified by their respective counsel.

4. Though the offence punishable under Sections 498-A is compoundable with the permission of the Court and the offence punishable under Section 354-B is a non-compoundable offence, but in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another*¹, the Full Bench of the Honourable Supreme Court laid down certain guidelines for recording

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303

compromise, wherein it was held that the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or F.I.R. or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal Court for compounding the offences. It further held that the exercise of power to quash the criminal proceedings or complaint or FIR, where the parties have settled their dispute, would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case. Before exercising the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. It further held that heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity etc., could not be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between victim and offender in relation to offences under special statutes like Prevention of Corruption Act or offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity etc., could not provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences.

5. By applying the principle laid down in the aforesaid judgment to the facts of the present case, since the petitioners and the 2nd respondent have compromised the matter at the intervention of elders and well wishers, I find that it is a fit case to permit them to compound the offences.

6. Accordingly, Crl.P.MP.No.18510 of 2016 is allowed. In view of the orders passed in Crl.P.MP.No.18510 of 2016, the proceedings in Crime No.123 of 2015 on the file of the Women Police Station, Nalgonda, Nalgonda District, are quashed. Accordingly, Crl.P.No.16385 of 2016 is allowed.

Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Criminal Petition, shall stand closed.

29th November, 2016
Bvv

M. SATYANARAYANA MURTHY, J

