



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.815 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21.11.2022

CORAM:

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

Crl.R.C.No.815 of 2018

G.Prabhu

... Petitioner

Vs.

S.Alwarappan

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Revision case has been filed under Section 397 r/w 401 of Cr.P.C, to call for the order passed in Crl.A.No.82 of 2016 dated 22.12.2017 by the Principal District Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur by modifying the judgment sentence to undergo simple imprisonment of 3 months and to pay compensation for a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- by confirming the order passed in S.T.C.No.310 of 2015 dated 19.10.2016 by the learned Fast Track Court No.II, Judicial Magistrate, Poonamallee and set-aside the same and thereby allow the Criminal Revision Petition and consequently acquit the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Sundaravadanam

For Respondent : Mr.R.T.Chidambaram

ORDER

This Criminal Revision case has been filed as against the Judgment passed in Crl.A.No.82 of 2016 dated 22.12.2017 by the learned Principal District Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur, by modifying the order passed in



Crl.R.C.No.815 of 2018

S.T.C.No.310 of 2015 dated 19.10.2016 by the Fast Track Court No.II, Judicial Magistrate, Poonamallee, thereby convicting the petitioner for the offence punishable under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that pending revision, parties have entered into a compromise and amicably settled their issues. They have also produced a Joint memo of Compromise, dated 04.11.2022 before this Court.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent also concedes with the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondent has no objection to set aside the conviction against the petitioner herein, since the respondent had received the entire cheque amount.

4. The Joint Memo of compromise, dated 04.11.2022 is extracted hereunder,

“It is most respectfully submitted that:-

(i) This Joint memorandum of compromise entered between the petitioner and the respondent in respect of payment of present cheque case which was agitated before trial and session's court and it is now pending before this Hon'ble Court.

(ii) Further in the meantime the both parties jointly decided to settle the matter amicably outside the court and whereby the



Crl.R.C.No.815 of 2018

WEB COPY

petitioner paid the cheque amount to the respondent as full and final settlement to the respondent and the same was received by the respondent also”.

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 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



WEB COPY

'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; (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



WEB COPY

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 passed in Crl.A.No.82 of 2016 dated 22.12.2017 by the learned Principal District Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur, by modifying the order passed in S.T.C.No.310 of 2015 dated 19.10.2016 by the Fast Track Court No.II, Judicial Magistrate, Poonamallee, are hereby set aside and the terms of Joint Memo of Compromise, dated 04.11.2022, shall form part and parcel of this Order.



Crl.R.C.No.815 of 2018

WEB COPY 7. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision case stands allowed.

21.11.2022

Internet: Yes

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non speaking order

mn



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.815 of 2018

To

- 1.The Principal District Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur.
- 2.The Fast Track Court No.II, Judicial Magistrate, Poonamallee.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.815 of 2018

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

mn

Crl.R.C.No.815 of 2018

21.11.2022