APHC010474852026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3504]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE 5th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 7980/2026

Between:

1. PALLAPU RAVITEJA, S/O. LATE CHENNAIAH,AGED ABOUT 22 YEARS,H.NO. 4-385, R/O. CHILLAKALLU VILLAGE,JAGGIAHPETA MANDAL,N.T.R DISTRICT.
2. PALLAPU SRINIVASA RAO ALIAS PALLAPU JAYA SRINIVAS, S/O. LATE CHENNAIAH,AGED ABOUT 20 YEARS,H.NO. 4-385,R/O. CHILLAKALLU VILLAGE,JAGGIAHPETA MANDAL,N.T.R DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH.
2. PALLAPU NARENDRA KUMAR, S/O. SHIVA, AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS. D.NO. 4-404/1,R/O. BESIDE VEDDARI ROAD,CHILLAKALLU VILLAGE,JAGGIAHPETA MANDAL,N.T.R DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT(S):

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C and 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court to Quash the proceedings as against Petitioners/Accused No.4 and 5 in CC No.801 OF 2024 on the file of Additional Judicial Magistrate of P* Class, Jaggiahpeta charged under Sections 329(3), 324(5), 351(2) r/w 3(5) of BharatiyaNyayaSanhita, 2023

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C and 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased dispense with filing of certified copies CC No.801 OF 2024 on the file of Additional Judicial Magistrate of 1st Class, Jaggiahpeta

charged under Sections 329(3), 324(5), 351(2) r/w 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023

IA NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C and 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to record the compromise and quash the proceedings as against the petitioners in CC No.801 OF 2024 on the file of Additional Judicial Magistrate of 1st Class, Jaggiahpeta charged under Sections 329(3), 324(5), 351(2) r/w 3(5) of BharatiyaNyayaSanhita, 2023

IA NO: 3 OF 2026

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C and 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition,the High Court may be pleased permit the petitioner herein to file the compromise petition in the Quash Petition preferred against in CC No.801 OF 2024 on the file of Additional Judicial Magistrate of 1st Class, Jaggiahpeta charged under Sections 329(3), 324(5), 351(2) r/w3(5) of BharatiyaNyayaSanhita, 2023

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused(S):

1. BUDATI GNANENDER KUMAR REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant(S):

1. YALAL ABDUL HAFEEZ
2. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

IA Nos.2 and 3 OF 2026

in/and

Criminal Petition No:7980 OF 2026

The Court made the following Common Order:

Instant Criminal Petition, under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhitha, 2023, has been filed on behalf of the petitioners herein (A4 & A5), seeking to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.801 of 2024 on the file of the Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate, Jaggaiahpeta, wherein they were charged with the offences punishable under Sections 329(3), 324(5) and 351(2) read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. It is represented that both the parties have settled the dispute amicably out of the Court at the intervention of their elders and well-wishers. In view of the settlement arrived between both the parties, they filed IA Nos.2 and 3 of 2026 seeking to permit them to compound the offences and to record the compromise.

3. It is stated by the 2nd respondent-*de facto* complainant in the affidavit filed in support of IA No.2 of 2026 that as per the advice of the well-wishers and family elders of both sides, he compromised the matter. He further stated in the affidavit that there is no coercion, force or misrepresentation from anybody in giving the said affidavit or in compounding the present case and out of his free will and wish, he was giving the affidavit.

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of respondent No.1-State and learned counsel for respondent No.2.

5. In ***State of M.P. V. Laxmi Narayan*** [1], after perceiving the well-established principles, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

> **"15. Considering the law on the point and the other decisions of this Court on the point, referred to hereinabove, it is observed and held as under:**
>
> **15.1.** That the power conferred under Section 482 of the Code to quash the criminal proceedings for the non-compoundable offences under Section 320 of the Code can be exercised having overwhelmingly and predominantly the civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes and when the parties have resolved the entire dispute amongst themselves;
>
> **15.2.** Such power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involved heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society;
>
> **15.3.** Similarly, such power is not to be exercised for the offences under the special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender;
>
> **15.4.** Offences under Section 307 IPC and the Arms Act, etc. would fall in the category of heinous and serious offences and therefore are to be treated as crime against the society and not against the individual alone, and therefore, the criminal proceedings for the offence under Section 307 IPC and/or the Arms Act, etc. which have a serious impact on the society cannot be quashed in exercise of powers under Section 482 of the Code,

[1](2019) 5 SCC 688

on the ground that the parties have resolved their entire dispute amongst themselves. However, the High Court would not rest its decision merely because there is a mention of Section 307 IPC in the FIR or the charge is framed under this provision. It would be open to the High Court to examine as to whether incorporation of Section 307 IPC is there for the sake of it or the prosecution has collected sufficient evidence, which if proved, would lead to framing the charge under Section 307 IPC. For this purpose, it would be open to the High Court to go by the nature of injury sustained, whether such injury is inflicted on the vital/delicate parts of the body, nature of weapons used, etc. However, such an exercise by the High Court would be permissible only after the evidence is collected after investigation and the charge-sheet is filed/charge is framed and/or during the trial. Such exercise is not permissible when the matter is still under investigation. Therefore, the ultimate conclusion in paras 29.6 and 29.7 of the decision of this Court in ***Narinder Singh***[2] should be read harmoniously and to be read as a whole and in the circumstances stated hereinabove;

15.5.[3] While exercising the power under Section 482 of the Code to quash the criminal proceedings in respect of non-compoundable offences, which are private in nature and do not have a serious impact on society, on the ground that there is a settlement/compromise between the victim and the offender, the High Court is required to consider the antecedents of the accused; the conduct of the accused, namely, whether the accused was absconding and why he was absconding, how he had managed with the complainant to enter into a compromise, etc."

6. In this context, Apex Court, by reiterating the principles in ***Ram Gopal Vs. State of M.P.***[4], in its vivid terms expressed as under:

19. We thus, sum up 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 Constitution, can be invoked beyond the metes and bounds of Section 320 Cr.P.C. Nonetheless, we reiterate that such powers of wide

---

[2] ***[Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab, (2014) 6 SCC 466 : (2014) 3 SCC (Cri) 54]***
3 [Ed.: Para 15.5 corrected vide Official Corrigendum No. F.3/Ed.B.J./22/2019 dated 3-4-2019.].
[4]2024 (14) SCC 531

amplitude ought to be exercise carefully in the context of quashing criminal proceedings bearing in mind:

19.1. Nature and effect of the offence on the conscience of the society;

19.2 Seriousness of injury, if any;

19.3 Voluntary nature of compromise between the accused and the victim; and

19.4 Conduct of the accused persons, prior to and after the occurrence of the purported offence and/or other relevant considerations."

7. Recently, Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Naushey Ali and Others Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another***[5], by dealing with law on the subject, in its clear words affirmed the above principles.

8. Today, when the case is called, both the parties are present before this Court. Learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for respondent No.2 identified both the parties in the open Court. This Court questioned the *de facto* complainant with regard to compromise, and he has categorically stated that he has voluntarily entered into compromise with the petitioners herein.

9. It is pertinent to note that both the petitioners and the 2nd respondent are distant relatives. It is also brought to the notice of this Court by the respective parties that the 1st petitioner herein (A4) has completed B.Tech., and the 2nd petitioner herein (A5) is studying in the final year of the B.Tech., professional course. Today, the *de facto* complainant is present before this Court and has voluntarily expressed his free will and consent to quash the

[5] (2025) 4 SCC 78

proceedings in C.C.No.801 of 2024 on the file of the Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate, Jaggaiahpeta, against the petitioners herein (A4 & A5).

10. Learned counsel for the petitioners also filed the relevant educational certificates of the petitioners herein through a memo dated 23.09.2026. The Aadhaar cards of the respective parties were also filed along with the joint memo dated 10.09.2026.

11. Keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, coupled with the nature of the offences, as no adverse antecedents or conduct was found against the accused, the parties on their free will and volition, willingly to put a quietus to all their disputes, which will advance peace and harmony among the parties. More so, the cause of administration of the criminal justice system would remain unaffected.

12. This Court also places reliance on the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Lovely Salhotra & another v. State (NCT of Delhi) & another*** [6] and ***Prashant Prakash Ratnaparki & Others v. State of Maharashtra & Another***[7]. In view of the principles laid down therein, this Court is inclined to invoke its power under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 corresponding to Section 482 Cr.P.C., in the present *lis*, this Criminal Petition is allowed, and proceedings in C.C.No.801 of

[6] (2018) 12 SCC 391
[7] 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2464

2024 on the file of the Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate, Jaggaiahpeta, against the petitioners herein (A4 & A5), is hereby quashed.

13. Accordingly, I.A.Nos.2 and 3 of 2026 and Criminal Petition No.7980 of 2026 are allowed.

As a sequel, Interlocutory Applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

_____

MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM, J

Dated: 05.10.2026
MDP