



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.1084 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17.10.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

Crl.R.C.No.1084 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P.Nos.12619 of 2018 and 3680 & 3681 of 2020

Satyajith K.Hattangady,
Senior Manager,
Production Home,
Alacrity Foundation Pvt., 'ATANDRA',
New No.25, Old No.15,
Thirumalai Road,
T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

...

Petitioner

Vs

M/s.Chettinad Cements Corporation Ltd.,
Rep by A.L.Solaimalai, Manager, Accounts
Power Agent,
603, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 006.

...

Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 397 read with Section 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to set aside the Judgment dated 14.08.2018 passed in C.A.No.49 of 2016 by the VII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai, confirming the order dated 29.01.2016 in C.C.No.12306 of 2003 on the file of the Metropolitan Magistrate, II-Fast Track Court, Egmore, Chennai.

For Petitioner

: Mr.M.Madhuprakash

For Respondent

: Mr.T.Balaji

ORDER



Crl.R.C.No.1084 of 2018

WEB COPY This Criminal Revision case has been filed to set aside the judgment dated 14.08.2018 passed in C.A.No.49 of 2016 by the VII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai, thereby confirming the order dated 29.01.2016 passed in C.C.No.12306 of 2003 by the Metropolitan Magistrate, II-Fast Track Court, Egmore, Chennai, thereby convicted the petitioner for the offence punishable under Section 138 of Negotiable Instrument Act.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that pending revision, the parties have entered into a Memo of Compromise dated 17.10.2022.

3. On perusal of the Memo of Compromise dated 17.10.2022, they settled the matter and the respondent has no objection to set aside the conviction as against the petitioner herein.

4. In this regard, it is relevant to rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Ramgopal and others vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh reported in 2021 (6) CTC 240*** and the relevant paragraphs are extracted hereunder:-



WEB COPY

18. *It is now a well crystalized axiom that the plenary jurisdiction of this Court to impart complete justice under [Article 142](#) cannot ipso facto be limited or restricted by ordinary statutory provisions. It is also noteworthy that even in the absence of an express provision akin to [Section 482](#) Cr.P.C. conferring powers on the Supreme Court to abrogate and set aside criminal proceedings, the jurisdiction exercisable under [Article 142](#) of the Constitution embraces this Court with scopious powers to quash criminal proceedings also, so as to secure complete justice. In doing so, due regard must be given to the overarching objective of sentencing in the criminal justice system, which is grounded on the sub-lime philosophy of maintenance of peace of the collective and that the rationale of placing an individual behind bars is aimed at his reformation.*

19. *We thus sumup and hold that as opposed to [Section 320](#) Cr.P.C. where the Court is squarely guided by the compromise between the parties in respect of offences 'compoundable' within the statutory framework, the extraordinary power enjoined upon a High Court under [Section 482](#) Cr.P.C. or vested in this Court under [Article 142](#) of the Constitution, can be invoked beyond the metes and bounds of [Section 320](#) Cr.P.C. Nonetheless, we reiterate that such powers of wide amplitude ought to be exercised carefully in the context of quashing criminal proceedings, bearing in mind: (i) Nature and effect of the offence on the conscious of the society;*



WEB COPY

(ii) *Seriousness of the injury, if any; (iii) Voluntary nature of compromise between the accused and the victim; & (iv) Conduct of the accused persons, prior to and after the occurrence of the purported offence and/or other relevant considerations.*

20. *Having appraised the aforestated parameters and weighing upon the peculiar facts and circumstances of the two appeals before us, we are inclined to invoke powers under [Article 142](#) and quash the criminal proceedings and consequently set aside the conviction in both the appeals. We say so for the reasons that: Firstly, the occurrence(s) involved in these appeals can be categorized as purely personal or having overtones of criminal proceedings of private nature; Secondly, the nature of injuries incurred, for which the Appellants have been convicted, do not appear to exhibit their mental depravity or commission of an offence of such a serious nature that quashing of which would override public interest; Thirdly, given the nature of the offence and injuries, it is immaterial that the trial against the Appellants had been concluded or their appeal(s) against conviction stand dismissed; Fourthly, the parties on their own volition, without any coercion or compulsion, willingly and voluntarily have buried their differences and wish to accord a quietus to their dispute(s); Fifthly, the occurrence(s) in both the cases took place way back in the years 2000 and 1995, respectively. There*



Crl.R.C.No.1084 of 2018

is nothing on record to evince that either before or after the purported compromise, any untoward incident transpired between the parties;

Sixthly, since the Appellants and the complainant(s) are residents of the same village(s) and/or work in close vicinity, the quashing of criminal proceedings will advance peace, harmony, and fellowship amongst the parties who have decided to forget and forgive any illwill and have no vengeance against each other; and Seventhly, the cause of administration of criminal justice system would remain unaffected on acceptance of the amicable settlement between the parties and/or resultant acquittal of the Appellants; more so looking at their present age.

5. In view of the above, the Judgment dated 14.08.2018 passed in C.A.No.49 of 2016 by the VII Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai and the order dated 29.01.2016 passed in C.C.No.12306 of 2003 by the Metropolitan Magistrate, II-Fast Track Court, Egmore, Chennai, are hereby set aside and the terms of Joint Memo of Compromise, dated 17.10.2022, shall form part and parcel of this order. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case stands allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

17.10.2022



Crl.R.C.No.1084 of 2018

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

WEB COPY
Lpp



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.1084 of 2018

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

Lpp

To

1.The VII Additional Sessions Judge,
Chennai.

2.The Metropolitan Magistrate,
Fast Track Court – II,
Egmore, Chennai.

Crl.RC.No.1084 of 2018

17.10.2022