



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 16.04.2015

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.SUNDRESH

CRL.O.P. (MD) No.5846 of 2015

1. Seeni Abul @ Seeni Avul
@ Kutti

2. Mohammed Fazil @ Basil

... Petitioners/ Accused 1&5

vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu,
The Inspector of Police,
Thiruppullani Police Station,
Ramnad District.
(Crime No.242 of 2012)

... Respondent-1/ Complainant

2. Antony Kriminali

... Respondent-2/ Defacto complainant

PRAYER: This Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records in ***Crime NO.242 of 2012** on the file of the first respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Saravanan

For Respondents : Mr.S.Prabha

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
for R.1

: Mr.P.T.Ramesh Raja for R.2

ORDER


This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to call for the records in ***Crime NO.242 of 2012** on the file of the first respondent and quash the same.

2. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioners, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent and the learned Counsel for the second respondent.

3. The petitioners are arrayed as accused Nos.1 and 5 in Cr.No.242 of 2014, for the alleged offence under Sections 147, 148, 323, 324, 307 I.P.C. and Section 7(1) (A) CLA Act.

4. When the matter is taken up for hearing, a joint memo of compromise has been filed by both parties and attested by the Counsel for both parties. In paragraph No.2 of the joint compromise memo, it has been stated as follows:

"2. Both parties submits that now the entire dispute between the 2nd respondent is settled amicably out of the Court. Since the accused and the complainant belongs to the same area, at the



instance of the elder members of the family to avoid further dispute among themselves, both the parties expressed their desire to put an quietus to the dispute. Further, the 2nd respondent herein is willing to compound the offence and express his consent to withdraw her complaint. The 2nd respondent herein express no objection for quashing the complaint in Crime No.242/2012 on the file of the 1st respondent."

5. This Court has also perused the nature of complaint. This Court is of the view that no useful purpose will be served by proceedings further in this matter.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the proceedings in ***Cr.No.242 of 2012**, on the file of the first respondent is quashed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (T&P)

***Corrected as per order dated 19.06.2015
made in CRL OP(MD)No. 5846 of 2015.**

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CO)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

TO BE SUBSTITUTED TO THE ORDER ALREADY DESPATCHED ON 16.04.2015

1. The Inspector of Police,
Thiruppullani Police Station,
Ramnad District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1cc to Mr.M.SARAVANAN, Advocate, in SR. No. 19247

+1cc to M/S.R.J.Karthick,Advocate in SR.No 31991

TS/05.05.2015/2P-4C

TS/23.06.2015/2P -5C

CRL.O.P. (MD)No.5846 of 2015

16.04.2015