



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 25.11.2021

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18291 of 2021

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)No.10056 of 2021

Manikandan

... Petitioner /
Sole Accused

vs.

1.The State rep. by
Inspector of Police,
Mukkudal Police Station,
Tirunelveli District,
Crime No.141 of 2021

... 1st Respondent/
Complainant

2.Mahalakshmi

... 2nd Respondent/
defacto Complainant

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records pertaining to FIR in Crime No.141 of 2021 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Mukkudal Police Station, Tirunelveli District and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Sathyachidambaram

For R1 : Mr.M.Sakthikumar
Government Advocate

For R2 : Mr.B.Santhanam Rajeshkumar

O R D E R

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed for quashing the FIR in Crime No.141 of 2021 registered on the file of the first respondent.

2. The defacto complainant is present in person before this Court. She has been duly identified by Thiru.V.Arun Kumar GrI.4138, attached to Mukkudal Police Station, Tirunelveli District. The petitioner and the victim have got married. Marriage has also been registered. They are living together.

3. In these circumstances, continuation of the impugned prosecution is not really going to secure the ends of justice. I am conscious that the offences under POCSO Act are not compoundable. However, a learned judge of this Court, vide order dated 27.01.2021



in the decision reported in CDJ 2021 MHC 636 (Vijayalakshmi Vs. State rep. by the Inspector of Police) had held as follows:-

"19.The main issue that requires the consideration of this Court is as to whether this Court can quash the criminal proceedings involving non-compoundable offences pending against the second respondent. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Parbathbhai Aahir @ Parbathbhai Vs. State of Gujarath reported in 2017 9 SCC 641 and in the case of The State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Dhruv Gurjar and another reported in (2019) 2 MLJ Crl 10 has given sufficient guidelines that must be taken into consideration by this Court while exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., to quash non-compoundable offences. One very important test that has been laid down is that the Court must necessarily examine if the crime in question is purely individual in nature or a crime against the society with overriding public interest. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the offences against the society with overriding public interest even if it gets settled between the parties, cannot be quashed by this Court.

20. In the present case, the offences in question are purely individual / personal in nature. It involves the second petitioner and the second respondent and their respective families only. It involves the future of two young who are still in their early twenties. The second respondent is working as an auto driver to eke his livelihood. Quashing the proceedings, will not affect any overriding public interest in this case and it will in fact pave way for the second petitioner and the second respondent to settle down in their life and look for better future prospects. No useful purpose will be served in continuing with the criminal proceedings and keeping these proceedings will only swell the mental agony of the victim girl and her mother and not to forget the second respondent as well."

4. Respectfully adopting the very same approach, I quash the impugned FIR. The parties have also filed a joint memo of compromise before this Court. The same is taken on record. The impugned FIR stand quashed. This Criminal Original Petition is allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS I)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

rmi



Encl:-Photocopy of Compromise Memo attached.

Note : In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Mukkudal Police Station,
Tirunelveli District,
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.18291 of 2021
25.11.2021

MGJ(06.12.2021) 3P 3C