



WEB COPY



CrI.R.C.No.260 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27.10.2022

CORAM:

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

CrI.R.C.No.260 of 2018

1. M/s Event India,
a partnership firm
represented by its Managing Partner,
N.Prasanna,
569, D.B.Road,
R.S.Puram,
Coimbatore-641 002.

2. N.Prasanna

... Petitioners

Vs.

P.Suresh Kumar

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Revision case has been filed under Section 397 r/w 401 of Cr.P.C, to allow the above Criminal Revision Petition by setting aside the Judgment dated 15.11.2017 passed in C.A.No.174 of 2016 on the file of the II Additional District Court, Erode reversing the Judgment dated 05.05.2016 passed in S.T.C.No.568 of 2012 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court (Fast Track Court No.1), Erode.

For Petitioners	: Mr.K.Govi Ganesan
For Respondent	: Mr.A.Selvanambi for Mr.V.Meenakshisundaram



Crl.R.C.No.260 of 2018

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Revision case has been filed as against the Judgment passed in C.A.No.174 of 2016, dated 15.11.2017, on the file of the learned II Additional District Court, Erode, thereby reversed the order passed in S.T.C.No.568 of 2012 dated 05.05.2016, on file of the Judicial Magistrate Court (Fast Track Court No.1), Erode.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that pending the revision, the parties have entered into a compromise. The respondent had agreed to receive the cheque amount. Already the second petitioner had deposited 50% of the cheque amount to the credit of the Trial Court. Now, the second petitioner had also paid the remaining cheque amount to the respondent and the same was also duly received by him.

3. 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:-

18. It is now a well crystalized axiom that the plenary jurisdiction of this Court to impart complete justice under



WEB COPY

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 extra-ordinary 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; (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 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



Crl.R.C.No.260 of 2018

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.

4. In view of the above, the Judgment passed in C.A.No.174 of 2016, dated 15.11.2017, on the file of the learned II Additional District Court, Erode, is hereby set aside. The respondent is permitted to withdraw the amount which was already deposited by the petitioner to the credit of S.T.C.No.568 of 2012, on file of the Judicial Magistrate Court (Fast Track Court No.1), Erode, by way of filing appropriate application. It is made clear that the Trial Court shall permit the same, without ordering notice to the petitioner.

5. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision case stands allowed.

27.10.2022

Internet: Yes
Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non speaking order
mn



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.260 of 2018

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

mn

To

- 1.The II Additional District Court, Erode.
- 2.The Judicial Magistrate Court (Fast Track Court No.1), Erode.

Crl.R.C.No.260 of 2018

27.10.2022