

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE U.DURGA PRASAD RAO

CRL.M.P.No.2323 of 2015 in Crl.P.No.2132 of 2015

and

Crl.P.No.2132 of 2015

COMMON ORDER

The *de facto* complainant and her counsel Ms.Rameswari Masineni are present. Accused and their counsel Sri P.Vishnuvardhan Reddy are present

2. Heard both sides on perused the compromise petition.

3. On the report given by the *de facto* complainant, the police, C.I.D. Police Station, W.P.C., Hyderabad, registered a case in Crime No.59 of 2012 for the offences under Sections 420, 406 and 506 IPC against the accused and the learned VI Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Nampally, took the cognizance of the same and registered as C.C.No.534 of 2013.

4. Now, the submission of both sides is that at the intervention of elders, the parties have entered into a compromise and hence, permission may be accorded for compounding the offences and quash the proceedings in C.C.No.534 of 2013.

5. Having regard to the above said submission and considering the fact that it is a matrimonial matter and parties have amicably settled their dispute and no purpose will be served even if the parties are driven to trial and following the decision reported in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another**, compromise is recorded in terms of accompanying compromise petition and consequently the proceedings in C.C.No.534 of 2013 on the file of the VI Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Hyderabad at Nampally, are hereby quashed.`

6. In the result, both the petitions are allowed. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

U.DURGA PRASAD RAO, J

27th March 2015.

mar