

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K.JAISWAL

Crl.P.M.P.No.13097 of 2016

and

Criminal Petition No.11781 of 2016

ORDER:

The criminal petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the crime No.500 of 2015 of Visakhapatnam IV Town Police Station, Visakhapatnam City, registered for the offences punishable under sections 354(d)(2), 506 and 509 I.P.C. and sections 66(c) and 67(b) of the Information Technology Act.

2. The 2nd Respondent – de facto-complainant filed Crl.P.M.P.No.13097 of 2016 seeking permission of the Court to compound the offences.

3. Today, when the matter came up for hearing, the second respondent/de facto-complainant and the petitioner/accused are present and are identified by their respective counsel. They also produced the xerox copies of their Identity Cards. It is submitted by both parties that at the intervention of the elders, the parties have amicably settled their disputes concerning the present case, hence compromise may be recorded and criminal proceedings in the above case may be quashed.

4. The victim girl also filed sworn affidavit stating that the incident occurred in the year 2013 and the crime was registered in the year 2015. In the interregnum period, she got married and leading peaceful marital life and she expressed her

willingness for closing the crime. She authorized her father, who is the de facto-complainant, to appear before the Court on her behalf and also to file relevant affidavit. She further stated that she has taken decision for closing the crime in her own interest and also in the interest of her family life and as per the advice of the elders.

5. In ***Yogendra Yadav and others v. the State of Jharkhand***^[1] the Supreme Court, in the matter of compromise of a non-compoundable offence, held as under:

“The question before this Court is whether this Court can compound the offences under Sections 326 and 307 of the IPC, which are non-compoundable. Needless to say that offences which are non-compoundable cannot be compounded by the court. Courts draw the power of compounding offences from Section 320 of the Code. The said provision has to be strictly followed (*Gian Singh v. State of Punjab* {(2012) 10 SCC 303}). However, in a given case, the High Court can quash a criminal proceeding in exercise of its power under Section 482 of the Code having regard to the fact that the parties have amicably settled their disputes and the victim has no objection, even though the offences are non-compoundable. In which cases the High Court can exercise its discretion to quash the proceedings depending on facts and circumstances of each case. Offences, which involve moral turpitude, grave offences like rape, murder etc. cannot be effaced by quashing the proceedings because that will have harmful effect on the society. Such offences cannot be said to be restricted to two individuals or two groups. If such offences are quashed, it may send wrong signal to the society. However, when the High Court is convinced that the offences are entirely personal in nature and, therefore, do not affect public peace or tranquility and where it feels that quashing of such proceedings on account of compromise would bring about peace and would secure ends of justice, it should not hesitate

to quash them. In such cases, the prosecution becomes a lame prosecution. Pursuing such a lame prosecution would be waste of time and energy. That will also unsettle the compromise and obstruct restoration of peace.”

6. Having regard to the above submission and considering the fact that the parties have amicably settled the disputes among themselves out of Court and no useful purpose will be served even if the parties are driven to the trial as they compromised, and following the decision reported in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another***^[2] the criminal miscellaneous petition is allowed and compromise is recorded.

7. Accordingly, the CrI.P.M.P.No.13097 of 2016 and the Criminal Petition are allowed and the proceedings in crime No.500 of 2015 of Visakhapatnam IV Town Police Station, Visakhapatnam, are quashed against the petitioner/accused. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this criminal petition shall stand closed.

M.S.K.JAISWAL, J.

09th August, 2016

skmr

^[1] 2015 (1) ALD (CrI.) 240 (Supreme Court)

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