

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd. Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 07/11/2025

(2022) 11 KL CK 0171 High Court Of Kerala

Case No: Criminal Miscellaneous Petitions No. 7497 Of 2022

Robin T.A APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Kerala RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Nov. 15, 2022

Acts Referred:

• Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 - Section 320, 482

Indian Penal Code, 1860 - Section 34, 294(b), 506, 509

Hon'ble Judges: Dr. Kauser Edappagath, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Suhail Ali.A, A.Muhammed Musthafa, T.V. Neema

Final Decision: Allowed

Judgement

Dr. Kauser Edappagath, J

1. This Crl.M.C. has been preferred to quash all further proceedings pursuant to Annexure A1 FIR in Crime No.1829/2022 of Thrissur East Police

Station on the ground of settlement between the parties.

- 2. The petitioners are the accused Nos. 1 to 3. The 3rd respondent is the defacto complainant.
- 3. The offences alleged against the petitioners are punishable under Sections 294(b), 506, 509 and 34 of IPC.
- 4. The respondent No.3 entered appearance through counsel. An affidavit sworn in by her is also produced.
- 5. I have heard Sri. .Suhail Ali. A, the learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri. A. Muhammed Mustafa, the learned counsel for the respondent No.3

and Smt. T.V. Neema, the learned Senior Public Prosecutor.

6. The averments in the petition as well as the affidavit sworn in by the respondent No.3 would show that the entire dispute between the parties has

been amicably settled and the de facto complainant has decided not to proceed with the criminal proceedings further. The learned Prosecutor, on

instruction, submits that the matter was enquired into through the investigating officer and a statement of the de facto complainant was also recorded

wherein she reported that the matter was amicably settled.

7. The Apex Court in Gian Singh v. State of Punjab [2012 (4) KLT 108 (SC)], Narinder Singh and Others v. State of Punjab and Others

[(2014) 6 SCC 466] and in State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan and Others [(2019) 5 SCC 688] has held that the High Court by invoking

S.482 of Cr.P.C can quash criminal proceedings in relation to non compoundable offence where the parties have settled the matter between

themselves notwithstanding the bar under S.320 of Cr.P.C. if it is warranted in the given facts and circumstances of the case or to ensure the ends of

justice or to prevent abuse of process of any Court.

8. The dispute in the above case is purely personal in nature. No public interest or harmony will be adversely affected by quashing the proceedings

pursuant to Annexure A1. The offences in question do not fall within the category of offences prohibited for compounding in terms of the

pronouncement of the Apex Court in Gian Singh (supra), Narinder Singh (supra) and Laxmi Narayan (supra).

For the reasons stated above, I am of the view that no purpose will be served in proceeding with the matter any further. Accordingly, the Crl.M.C. is

allowed. All further proceedings pursuant to Annexure A1 FIR in Crime No.1829/2022 of Thrissur East Police Station hereby stands quashed.