

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.SATYANARAYANA MURTHY

Crl.P.M.P. NOs.526 & 527 of 2017 IN/ AND Crl.P.No.573 of 2017

COMMON ORDER:

Crl.P.M.P.(SR) NOs.433 & 434 of 2017: These petitions are filed under Section 320 of Criminal Procedure Code (for short "Cr.P.C.") seeking permission to record compromise and to compound the offences among the parties in D.V.C.No.2 of 2014 on the file of the II Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate, Khammam.

The parties present in person and they are identified by their respective counsel, produced the photostat copies of adhar cards in proof of their identity.

On enquiry, the petitioners and the respondents stated that the matter is compromised and in terms of the compromise, a divorce decree was obtained and the husband paid Rs.20 lakhs towards full and final settlement of all the claims. The said compromise is voluntary and in the interest of both the parties. Even if the prosecution is allowed to continue, the chances of supporting the prosecution case are bleak and it would be a futile exercise.

In "*Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.*"¹ the Apex Court held that depending upon the facts and circumstances of each case, the High Court can exercise its inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., however before exercising such power, High Court must have due regard to nature and gravity of crime and its social impact. It is further held that heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc., could not be fittingly quashed even though victim or victim's family and offender have settled dispute. Such offences were not

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303

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.

By applying the principles laid down in the above judgment, since the settlement is in the interest of both parties, I find that it is a fit case to permit the petitioner to compound the offences.

Accordingly, permission is accorded as sought for.

Crl.P.(SR) No.430 of 2017:

In view of the orders passed in Crl.P.M.P.NOs.526 & 527 of 2017, this petition is allowed quashing the proceedings against the petitioners 1 to 5 in D.V.C.No.2 of 2014 on the file of the II Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate, Khammam.

The miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall also stand closed.

JUSTICE M. SATYANARAYANA MURTHY

Date: 04.01.2017
ccm

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.SATYANARAYANA MURTHY



Crl.P.M.P.(SR) NOs.526 & 527 of 2017 IN/ AND Crl.P.No.573 of 2017

Date:04.01.2017

ccm