

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE A. SHANKAR NARAYANA
CRIMINAL PETITION M.P. Nos.2117 AND 2118 OF 2017
IN/AND
CRIMINAL PETITION No.1550 OF 2017

COMMON ORDER:

The present Criminal Petition, under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, 'the Code'), is filed by the sole accused in P.R.C.No.5 of 2016 on the file of VI Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Warangal, requesting to quash the proceedings in the said P.R.C. registered for the offence punishable under Section 3 (1) (x) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

2. Criminal Petition M.P.Nos.2117 and 2118 of 2017, along with the affidavit of respondent No.1 - *de facto* complainant and Compromise Memo executed by the accused and *de facto* complainant, are filed by respondent No.1, under Section 320 of the Code, requesting to permit her to compound the offence in terms of the Compromise Memo and to quash the proceedings in the aforesaid P.R.C.

3. Both the parties as well as their counsel, namely, Sri P. Prabhakar Reddy, appearing for the petitioner - accused and Sri V. Siddhartha Goud, appearing for respondent No.1 - *de facto* complainant, are present and the parties are identified by their respective counsel. Petitioner - accused has produced photostat copy of his 'Driving Licence', whereas respondent No.1 - *de facto* complainant has produced photostat copy of her 'Aadhar Card', in proof of their identity.

4. The Compromise Memo annexed to Crl.P.MP.No.2118 of 2017 contains signature of the petitioner - accused and the right thumb impression of respondent No.1 - *de facto* complainant, and the signatures of their respective counsel. The *de facto* complainant affirmed the contents mentioned in the affidavit and the Compromise Memo. In the Compromise Memo, it is stated that the petitioner – accused and respondent No.1 – *de facto* complainant have compromised the matter at the intervention of elders and they have decided not to interfere with their respective lives.

5. Since the parties have entered into compromise and the quashment of proceedings in the present P.R.C would not have any impact on the society, when examined in the light of the guidelines laid down by the Honourable Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab**¹, further prosecution of the petitioner – accused for the offence alleged against him need not be continued.

6. Therefore, Criminal Petition M.P.Nos.2117 and 2118 of 2017 are allowed compounding the offence alleged against the petitioner - accused. Consequently, the Criminal Petition is allowed quashing the proceedings in P.R.C.No.5 of 2016 on the file of the VI Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Warangal. The Compromise Memo shall form part of the record. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Criminal Petition, shall stand closed.

A. SHANKAR NARAYANA, J

March 22, 2017.
MD

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303