

Mini vs State of Kerala

Mini vs State of Kerala

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1405333

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Dec-01-2023

Judge : Honourable Mr. Justice P.V.Kunhikrishnan

Appeal No. : Crl.MC/9636/2023

Appellant : MINI

Respondent : State of Kerala

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN
FRIDAY, THE 1ST DAY OF DECEMBER 2023 / 10TH AGRAHAYANA,
1945 CRL.MC NO. 9636 OF 2023 CRIME NO.196/2017 OF Wandoor
Police Station, Malappuram AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT CC
566/2017 OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE OF FIRST CLASS -
II, PERINTHALMANNA PETITIONER(S)/ACCUSED: 1 MINI , AGED 33
YEARS W/O. NEELANDAN, NEDUVATTY HOUSE, MANJAPPATTA
ELANKUR, ERNAD TALUK, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 676123 2
ARUN , AGED 36 YEARS S/O. VIJAYAN, ELANCHERIKUNNU HOUSE,
PUNNAPPALA P.O., NILAMBUR TALUK, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT,
PIN - 679328 BY ADV K.RAKESH RESPONDENT(S)/STATE &

COMPLAINANT:

1 STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC
PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF KERALA, PIN - 682031 2 THE
STATION HOUSE OFFICER WANDOOD POLICE STATION,
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 679328 3 DR.MUKSITH M, AGED 33
YEARS S/O. MOIDEENKUTTY, R.P. HOUSE, KACHERIPPARA,
AZHEACODE, KANNUR DISTRICT, PIN - 670009 4 SANAM
MAHAMOOD, AGED 29 YEARS W/O. MUKSITH M, R.P. HOUSE,
KACHERIPPARA, AZHEACODE, KANNUR DISTRICT, PIN - 670009 BY
ADV.SRI. M.P PRASANTH, PP SRI.SRI.KIRAN THOMAS

THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 01.12.2023, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J.

----- Dated this the
01st day of December, 2023

ORDER

This Criminal Miscellaneous Case is filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (the Code for the sake of brevity).

2. Petitioners are the accused in C.C.No.566/2017 on

the file of the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court - II, Perinthalmanna arising from Crime No.196/2017 of Wandoor Police Station. The above case is charge-sheeted against the petitioners alleging offences punishable under Sections 380, 461, 411 r/w 34 IPC.

3. The prosecution case is that the accused committed theft and thereby committed the above said offences.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that

the parties have settled their dispute and do not wish to pursue the prosecution proceedings. The counsel relies on the affidavits filed by the victims in support of his contention. The counsel appearing for the victims also submitted that the matter is settled and the victims have no objection in quashing the prosecution.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, on instructions, has

expressed reservations about quashing the proceedings solely on the basis of the settlement. But the Public Prosecutor conceded that the matter is settled between the parties.

6. This Court has considered the submission of the petitioners, victims and the Public Prosecutor and has also gone through the records including the affidavits filed by the victims.

7. In *State of Madhya Pradesh v Laxmi Narayan*

and Others (2019 (5) SCC 688), three judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has summarized the situation in which non compoundable offences can be quashed invoking the powers under Section 482 of the Code. The apex court in *Laxmi Narayan's case (supra)* also relied on the law laid down in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another* (2012 (10) SCC 303) and *Narinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another* (2014 (6) SCC 466). The apex court in paragraph 13 of the *Laxmi Narayan's case* discussed the law in detail and the same is extracted hereunder:

13. Considering the law on the point and the other decisions of this Court on the point, referred to herein above, it is observed and held as under: i) that the power conferred under S.482 of the Code to quash the criminal proceedings for the non - compoundable offences under S.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; ii) 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; iii) similarly, such power is not to be exercised for the offences under the special statutes like 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; iv) offences under S.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 S.307 IPC and / or the Arms Act etc. which have a serious impact on the society cannot be quashed in exercise of powers under S.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 S.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 S.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 S.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 / delegate 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 paragraphs 29.6 and 29.7 of the decision of this Court in the case of Narinder Singh (supra) should be read harmoniously and to be read as a whole and in the circumstances stated herein above; v) while exercising the power

under S.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.

8. Keeping in mind the above dictum laid down by the

apex court, this court perused the facts in this case and also perused the documents produced by the parties. After going through the entire facts and circumstances I am of the considered opinion that the dispute is private in nature and the settlement can be accepted. Therefore, this Criminal Miscellaneous case is allowed. All further proceedings against the petitioners in C.C.No.566/2017 on the file of the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court - II, Perinthalmanna arising from Crime No.196/2017 of Wandoor Police Station are quashed. Sd/- P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN DM JUDGE APPENDIX OF CRL.MC 9636/2023 PETITIONER ANNEXURES ANNEXURE A TRUE COPY OF THE FINAL REPORT IN CRIME NO.196/2017 OF THE WANDOOR POLICE STATION ANNEXURE B THE AFFIDAVIT SWORN TO BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT DATED 30-10-2023 ANNEXURE C THE AFFIDAVIT SWORN TO BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT DATED 30-10-2023 RESPONDENTS EXHIBITS : NIL //TRUE COPY// PA TO JUDGE

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