HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:64903
CRL.P No. 3890 of 2024

CNR: KAHC010236672024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 21ST DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.3890 OF 2024

BETWEEN:

1. ARTHUR RAJASEELAN VIMAL
VIDE ORDER DATED 10.03.2026,
THE PRESENT PETITION HAS BEEN REJECTED
IN RESPECT OF QUO PETITIONER / ACCUSED NO.1.

2. ROOPKUMAR
S/O JAYASEELAN,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.407,
SRI. ABHIRAM EMERALD CREEK,
3RD CROSS,
RELIABLE RESIDENCY LAYOUT,
SOMASANDRA PALYA, HSR,
BENGALURU - 560 102.

Digitally signed by PANKAJA S
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

3. LATHA MARGET
W/O ROOPAKUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.407,
SRI. ABHIRAM EMERALD CREEK,
3RD CROSS,
RELIABLE RESIDENCY LAYOUT,
SOMASANDRA PALYA, HSR,
BENGALURU - 560 102.

4. ABHISHEK RAJKUMAR
SON OF ROOPKUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.407,

SRI. ABHIRAM EMERALD CREEK,
3RD CROSS,
RELIABLE RESIDENCY LAYOUT,
SOMASANDRA PALYA,
HSR, BENGALURU-560 102.

ALL PETITIONERS CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT PLOT NO.81,
DAYANAGAR,
DAYAPURAM,
MAANAMADURAI,
TAMIL NADU - 630 606.

…PETITIONERS

(BY SMT. URMILA PULLAT, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY BANDEPALYA POLICE STATION,
REPRESENTED BY THE SPP,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
BENGALURU-560 001.

2. CYNTHYA RUBAVATHY
WIFE OF ARTHUR RAJASEELAN VIMAL,
ALSO D/O EBENEZER V,
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.407,
SRI. ABHIRAM EMERALD CREEK,
3RD CROSS,
RELIABLE RESIDENCY LAYOUT,
SOMASANDRA PALYA, HSR,
BENGALURU - 560 102.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MAHESHA P, HCGP FOR R1;

SRI. S.R.DODAWAD, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED UNDER SECTION 482 OF CR.PC. PRAYING TO QUASH THE FIR AND COMPLAINT IN CR.NO.0068/2024, BANDEPALYA POLICE STATION, FOR THE OFFENCES UNDER SECTION 498A OF IPC, SECTIONS 3 AND 4 OF THE DOWRY PROHIBITION ACT, 1961, PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE IX ADDL. CHIEF METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE, BENGALURU, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

ORAL ORDER

Learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for respondent No.2 filed an application under Section 320(8) of Cr.P.C. r/w Section 482 of Cr.P.C. to compound the offences alleged against the petitioners.

2. The application is accompanied with the joint affidavit of the parties. It is stated in the affidavit, the petitioners and respondent No.2 have amicably settled their dispute before the Karnataka Mediation Centre, Bengaluru. The learned counsel for the petitioners has filed memorandum of settlement under Section 89 of CPC r/w Rules 24 and 25 of the

Karnataka Civil Procedure (Mediation) Rules 2005, executed before the Karnataka Mediation Centre, in M.C.No.6534/2024, which is disposed of by the Principal Judge, Family Court at Bengaluru.

3. The parties are present before this Court. The joint affidavit reveals that the marriage solemnized between respondent No.2 and accused No.1 is dissolved in a decree of divorce dated 30.09.2026 in M.C.No.6534/2024. As per the terms of settlement, the petitioners and accused No.1 agreed to pay a full and final settlement of Rs.31,00,000/- to respondent No.2. Out of said amount, the part payment was made while entering into the settlement and while closing the proceedings in DV Act.

4. Today, the petitioners handed over a DD for a sum of Rs.10,60,000/- drawn by accused No.1 in favour of respondent No.2. The respondent No.2 acknowledged the receipt of the same. Hence, respondent No.2 submitted that the proceedings initiated against the petitioners based on her complaint be quashed against the petitioners.

5. Placing reliance on their submission and the memorandum of settlement, I am of the view that the continuation of the proceedings against the petitioners is nothing but abuse of the process of Court. Though, the offences alleged against the petitioners are non-compoundable in nature, however, having regard to the fact that the dispute between the parties is purely private and matrimonial in nature, and in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***GIAN SINGH V. STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER,*** reported in ***(2012) 10 SCC 303***, I am of the considered opinion that the settlement arrived at between the parties can be taken into consideration.

6. Accordingly, the application filed under Section 320(8) of Cr.P.C. r/w Section 482 of Cr.P.C. is allowed. The petitioners and respondent No.2 are permitted to compound the offences.

7. Consequently, the petition is ***disposed of*** in terms of settlement. The proceedings against the petitioners/accused Nos.2 to 4 in Crime No.68/2024 registered by Bandepalya Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 498A

of IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, presently, pending on the file of IX Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Bengaluru is hereby quashed.

SD/-
(RAJESH RAI K)
JUDGE

CR
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 10