HC-KAR
NC: 2026:KHC:64337
CRL.P No. 3365 of 2021
CNR: KAHC010173672021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 21ST DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.P.SANDESH

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.3365 OF 2021

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. HANUMAIAH,
   S/O LATE RANGAIAH,
   AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS.

2. SMT. PARVATHAMMA,
   W/O HANUMAIAH,
   AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS.

3. SMT. SARASWATHAMMA,
   D/O HANUMAIAH,
   AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS.

4. SRI. DHANARAJ,
   S/O HANUMAIAH,
   AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS.

5. SMT. LALITHA,
   W/O DHANARAJ,
   AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS.

6. SMT. LAKSHMIDEVI,
   D/O HANUMAIAH,
   AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS.

7. SRI. JAYARAMA,
   S/O HANUMAIAH,
   AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS.

Digitally signed by DEVIKA M
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

8. SMT. RADHA,
S/O JAYARAMA H.,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS.

9. SRI. HONNASIDDAIAH G.S.,
S/O LATE SIDDAVENKATAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS.

ALL ARE
R/AT HONNAGANAHATTI VILLAGE,
TAVAREKERE HOBLI,
BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK,
BENGALURU-562130.

…PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. D.S.VIJAYENDRA REDDY, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY STATION HOUSE OFFICER,
TAVAREKERE POLICE STATION,
BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK,
BENGALURU-560029.

2. SRI. MANJUNATHA,
S/O LATE KEMPANNA,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
R/AT NO.72, 8TH CROSS,
GAJANANA NAGARA,
APPOLLO CONVENT ROAD,
HEGGANAHALLI CROSS,
SUNKADAKATTE,
BANGALORE-560091.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SUHAS GOWDA M., HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. NARAYAN M. NAIK, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

CNR: KAHC010173672021

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION FILED UNDER SECTION 482 OF CR.P.C PRAYING TO QUASH THE FIR REGISTERED IN CRIME NO.436/2020 ON 31.12.2020 OF TAVAREKERE POLICE STATION, FOR THE OFFENCES PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTIONS 406, 409, 417, 418, 420, 506 OF THE INDIAN PENAL CODE, PENDING ON THE FILE OF II ADDITIONAL CIVIL JUDGE (JR.DN) AND JMFC, MAGADI, RAMANAGARA DISTRICT.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR ADMISSION THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.P.SANDESH

ORAL ORDER

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for respondent No.1/State and the learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners relies upon the documents of certified copy of the order sheet in O.S.No.232/2021 and the certified copy of the compromise petition in O.S.No.232/2021. The learned counsel referring these documents would vehemently contend that the matter was compromised before the Court by filing a compromise petition. On the strength of these documents, the learned counsel prays this Court to quash the proceedings against the

petitioners bringing to the notice of this Court the contents of paragraph No.12 of the compromise, wherein it is stated that FIR No.436/2020 was registered and the party to the compromise had agreed to withdraw the FIR.

3. The learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant would submit that there is no dispute with regard to the fact that the matter was compromised before the Trial Court in O.S.No.232/2021. But the learned counsel brought to the notice of this Court paragraph No.6 wherein the petitioners had agreed to execute the registered document and so also brought to the notice of this Court the averments made in paragraph No.5 and even though this matter was compromised in 2021, till date not executed the document and even not rectified the mistake found in the documents and categorically admitted that at the time of executing the sale deed, even did not expect any additional amount and hence, the question of withdrawing this petition does not arise, since the petitioners have not acted upon in terms of the compromise.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant, the prayer is sought for quashing of Crime No.436/2020. Having considered the documents which have been produced, no doubt, the suit was compromised. But in terms of the compromise, the petitioners have not acted upon. The contents of paragraph Nos.5 and 6 of the compromise is very clear that the petitioners had to execute the document, but they have not executed the document as contended by the learned counsel for respondent No.2 and hence, withdrawal of this petition also does not arise. When specific accusation is made in the complaint, the matter requires to be investigated by the police since the contents of the complaint does disclose the ingredients of the offences which have been invoked against the petitioners and hence, no ground is made out to quash the proceedings initiated against the petitioners. On the strength of compromise petition, without compliance, the learned counsel for the petitioners cannot seek for quashing of the proceedings initiated against the petitioners on behalf of the petitioners.

5. In view of the discussions, made above, I pass the following:

ORDER

The petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(H.P.SANDESH)
JUDGE

MD
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 20