

Yesudas vs State of Kerala

Yesudas vs State of Kerala

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1348941

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Jul-31-2023

Judge : Honourable Mr. Justice Raja Vijayaraghavan V

Appeal No. : Crl.MC/2489/2023

Appellant : Yesudas

Respondent : State of Kerala

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJA VIJAYARAGHAVAN V
MONDAY, THE 31ST DAY OF JULY 2023 / 9TH SRAVANA, 1945 CRL.MC NO.
2489 OF 2023 IN CC 651/2015 OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE OF FIRST CLASS -I,
KOLLAM PETITIONERS/ACCUSED: 1 YESUDAS AGED 33 YEARS S/O
WILSON, PANDAKASSALLA PADINJATTATHIL, NEERAVIL P.O,
THRIKKADAVOOR, KOLLAM, PIN - 691601. 2 ROBIN AGED 35 YEARS S/O
ROBERT, ROBIN BHAVANAM, ASHTAMUDI P.O, THRIKKADAVOOR, KOLLAM,
PIN - 691602. 3 SAJEEVAN AGED 34 YEARS S/O RAJEEVAN, NEERAVIL P.O,
THRIKKADAVOOR, KOLLAM, PIN - 691601. BY ADVS. SAJU J PANICKER
KURIAN K JOSE RESPONDENTS/STATE/DE FACTO COMPLAINANT: 1 STATE
OF KERALA (CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, ANCHALUMOODU POLICE

STATION, CRIME NO. 1708 OF 2013) REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM. 2 LAIJU AGED 35 YEARS S/O RAJENDRAN, CHITHIRA, PATTAM THURUTHU WEST, MUNROTHURUTHU P.O, KOLLAM., PIN - 691502. SMT. NEEMA T V, SR. PP THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 31.07.2023, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING: CRL.MC NO. 2489 OF 2023 2

ORDER

This petition is filed invoking the powers of this Court under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (the Code for the sake of brevity).

2. The petitioners herein are the accused in C.C No.651 of 2015 of the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court I, Kollam, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 325, and 34 of the IPC.

3. The prosecution allegation, as borne out from the records, are

as under:- On 6.11.2013 at 9.15 p.m., the accused persons, in furtherance of their common intention, wrongfully restrained party respondent and attacked him, causing injuries.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties

have settled their dispute and do not wish to pursue the prosecution proceedings. He relies on the affidavit filed by the party respondent in support of his contention. Counsel argues that if the proceedings are terminated, with the recording of the amicable settlement, the parties can move forward in an atmosphere of peace and mutual respect.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, on instructions, has expressed

reservations about quashing the proceedings solely on the basis of the settlement. He argues that the facts and circumstances may not warrant the exercise of the court's inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

However, it is fairly submitted that no other crimes of CRL.MC NO. 2489 OF 2023 3 serious nature have been registered against the petitioners to date. It is further submitted that the statements of the party respondent have been recorded, and he has unequivocally stated that he does not have any lasting grievances.

6. I have considered the submissions and have gone through the records.

7. In State of M.P. v. Laxmi Narayan,¹ a three-judge bench

of the Honble Supreme Court has summarized the law as laid down in Gian Singh v. State of Punjab², Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab³ and in subsequent cases. It was laid down 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, 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 [Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab, (2014) 6 SCC 466 : (2014) 3 SCC (Cri) 54] should be read harmoniously and to be read as a whole and in the circumstances stated hereinabove; 15.5. While exercising the power under Section 482 of the Code to quash the criminal proceedings in respect of non-compoundable offenses, 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.

8. Having carefully analyzed the prayer sought in the light of the

principles laid down above and also the nature of the allegations, the gravity of the offense, the severity of injuries inflicted, antecedents of the accused, and the amicable relationship that now exists between the parties, I am of CRL.MC NO. 2489 OF 2023 5 the considered opinion that quashing the proceedings on the basis of the settlement will not have any adverse impact on society. In fact, it would only serve to bring about peace and secure the ends of justice. Additionally, persisting with the prosecution would be a waste of time, as the prospects of conviction are bleak. In light of all of the relevant circumstances, I am of the considered view that this Court would be well justified in invoking its extraordinary powers under Section 482 of the Code to quash the proceedings This petition is allowed. Annexure-A2 Final Report in Crime No.1708 of 2013 of the Anchalumoodu Police Station, and all further proceedings against the petitioners pending as C.C No.651 of 2015 of the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court I, Kollam, are quashed. Sd/- RAJA VIJAYARAGHAVAN V JUDGE Sru CRL.MC NO. 2489 OF 2023 6 APPENDIX OF CRL.MC 2489/2023 PETITIONERS ANNEXURES Annexure A1 TRUE COPY OF THE F.I.R IN CRIME NO. 1708/2013 OF ANCHALUMOODU POLICE STATION, KOLLAM. Annexure A2 CERTIFIED COPY OF THE CHARGE SHEET IN CRIME NO. 1708 OF 2013 OF ANCHALUMOODU POLICE STATION, KOLLAM. Annexure A3 AFFIDAVIT SWORN TO BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com