



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.427 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 31.10.2022

CORAM:

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

Crl.R.C.No.427 of 2018

Lucy Mathew

... Petitioner

Vs.

Srinivasan

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Revision case has been filed under Section 397 r/w 401 of Cr.P.C, to call for the records in the order and Judgment dated 07.12.2017 in C.A.No.21 of 2017 passed by the Learned II-Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tiruppur, thereby dismissing the appeal and confirming the order and Judgment dated 07.02.2017 in S.T.C.No.170 of 2012 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court, Tiruppur, set aside the same, acquit the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Baskar

For Respondent : Mr.N.S.Sivakumar

ORDER

This Criminal Revision case has been filed as against the order and Judgment dated 07.12.2017 in C.A.No.21 of 2017 passed by the Learned II-Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tiruppur, thereby dismissing the appeal and confirming the order and Judgment dated 07.02.2017 in S.T.C.No.170 of



CrI.R.C.No.427 of 2018

2012 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court, Tiruppur.

WEB COPY

2. Pending revision, parties have entered into a compromise and amicably settled their issues.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner had also filed a petition under Section 147 of the Negotiable Instruments Act.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent produced the receipt dated 29.10.2022, duly acknowledging the receipt of Demand Draft No.323952 dated 28.10.2022, for a sum of Rs.2,25,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Twenty Five Thousand only) towards the full and final settlement of all dues.

5. 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 [Article 142](#) cannot ipso facto be limited or restricted by



WEB COPY

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)



WEB COPY

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 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.

6. In view of the above, the Judgment dated 07.12.2017 in C.A.No.21 of 2017 passed by the Learned II-Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tiruppur, thereby dismissing the appeal and confirming the order dated 07.02.2017 in S.T.C.No.170 of 2012 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court, Tiruppur, are hereby set aside. The receipt given by the respondent, dated 29.10.2022 shall form part and parcel of this order. The respondent is permitted to withdraw the amount which is lying on the file of the Trial Court by way of filing appropriate application. It is made clear that the Trial Court shall permit the respondent to withdraw the same, without ordering any notice to the petitioner.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.427 of 2018

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision case stands allowed.

31.10.2022

Internet:Yes

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non speaking order

mn



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.427 of 2018

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

mn

To

- 1.The II-Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tiruppur.
- 2.The Judicial Magistrate, Fast Track Court, Tiruppur.

Crl.R.C.No.427 of 2018

31.10.2022