

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE No: CRIMINAL PETITION No.13127 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	09.09.2026	<u>JSR, J</u> This Criminal Petition is filed by the petitioner seeking to quash the proceedings in S.C.No.421 of 2023 on the file of the learned I Additional District and Sessions Judge-cum-Additional Family Court-cum-Special Sessions Judge for Fast Tracking the Cases relating to Atrocities against women, Malkajgiri. Heard Mr.G.Bharath Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr.Jithender Rao Veeramalla, learned counsel for respondent No.1 and Ms.Radhika Palla, learned counsel for respondent No.2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not committed the alleged offence and has been falsely implicated in the present case. Even according to the allegations levelled in the complaint or in the final report, the ingredients for the offence under Sections 417, 420, 493 and 376 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, are not attracted against the petitioner. The petitioner and respondent No.2 have known each other and their relation is consensual. Due to misunderstandings between petitioner and respondent No.2, respondent No.2 lodged the present	Transferred to i.o. folder before corrections, if any.

	complaint against the petitioner with an intention to harass him. However, at the instance of elders and well-wishers, the petitioner and respondent No.2 have entered into a settlement and filed applications vide I.A.Nos.2 and 3 of 2026 seeking to compound the offence and record the compromise. Along with the said applications, both parties have also filed a joint memo. When this Court raised a query as to whether the parties are entitled to seek recording of a compromise, particularly in respect of heinous offences, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 submits that, due to misunderstandings between the petitioner and respondent No.2, she lodged the complaint. She further submits that respondent No.2 does not want to prosecute the proceedings and submits that she wants to lead a peaceful and happy life. Unless this Court records the compromise and permits compounding of the offence, she would be put to great hardship. Respondent No.2 has filed her sworn affidavit along with I.A. Nos.2 and 3, wherein she has specifically stated that she does not wish to continue the proceedings against the petitioner. Learned counsel has relied upon the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in <i>Madhukar and others vs. State of Maharashtra</i>¹, wherein it was held that when the victim/<i>de-facto</i> complainant expresses that continuation of the prosecution would cause	
--	--	--

¹ 2025 LiveLaw (SC) 710

		further disruption to her personal life and that she does not wish to support the charges or pursue the matter further, this Court has the power to record the compromise and to compound the offences. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has not opposed the same. Taking into consideration the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, in view of the reasons stated by respondent No.2 in her sworn affidavit and also the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the judgment referred to above, the petitioner and respondent No.2 are directed to appear before the High Court Legal Services Committee for identification, along with their identity cards, on or before 25.09.2026. Taking into consideration the submissions of learned counsel for the respective parties, the Registry is directed to transmit the case file to the High Court Legal Services Committee immediately. The High Court Legal Services Committee shall in turn submit the report before this Court by the next date of hearing. Post on 30.09.2026 under the caption 'for compromise'. JSR,J sa	
--	--	---	--