

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA
PRADESH**

**CRL.P.MP.NOs.7294 And 7295 OF 2015 AND
CRLIMINAL PETITION NO.7390 OF 2015**

Between:

1. Syed Mubeen Hashmi and six others.

...PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NOS.1 TO 7

AND

1. State of Telangana, rep.by its Public Prosecutor, High Court at Hyderabad and one other.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 18.08.2015

-
SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-

-

THE HON'BLR SRI JUSTICE M.SEETHARAMA MURTI

-

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether Their Lordship wish to see the
fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.SEETHARAMA MURTI

CRL.P.MP.NOs.7294 And 7295 OF 2015 AND

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.7390 OF 2015

COMMON ORDER:

_____ This Criminal Petition has been filed by the petitioners/A-1 to A-7 under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking to quash the proceedings in S.C.No.250 of 2011 on the file of the learned VII Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Hyderabad against them in the said sessions case.

2. _____ When this Criminal Petition is taken up for hearing, the learned counsel for both the sides submitted that the parties have amicably settled the matter outside the Court and that the terms of compromise are reduced into writing in the form of joint memorandum of compromise and that Crl.P.MP.Nos.7294 and 7295 of 2015 are filed seeking permission to compound the offences in view of the terms of settlement arrived at between the parties and to record the compromise.

3. _____ The 2nd respondent/*de facto* complainant and the petitioners/A1 to A7 are present. They have been duly identified by their respective counsel. Both the parties had asserted the terms of Joint Memo of compromise. The second respondent-*de facto* complainant has stated that in view of the compromise, he is withdrawing his complaint and that he has no objection to record the compromise and compound the offences.

4. _____ This Court is satisfied that the parties had entered into compromise voluntarily with free Will and consent. Having regard to the terms of the joint memo, the submissions now made by the parties and as no useful purpose would be served in keeping the proceedings

pending, invoking the power under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, Crl.P.MP.Nos.7294 and 7295 of 2015 are ordered and the proceedings in Sessions Case No.250 of 2011 on the file of the VII Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Hyderabad, are hereby quashed.

5. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed quashing the proceedings in Sessions Case No.250 of 2011 on the file of the VII Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Hyderabad against the petitioners herein. The memorandum of compromise shall form part of this order.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this criminal petition shall stand closed.

(M.SEETHARAMA MURTI, J)

18th August 2015

RRB

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-