

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE U.DURGA PRASAD RAO
Crl.P.M.P.No.230 of 2015 in Crl.P.No.262 of 2015
and
Crl.P.No.262 of 2015

Common Order:

The de-facto complainant and his counsel Sri M.A.H.Amjad are present. Accused and their counsel Sri M.A.K.Mukheed are present.

Heard both sides.

On the private complaint filed by de-facto complainant, learned XII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, City Criminal Courts, Nampally, Hyderabad took cognizance of the same and registered as C.C.No.28 of 2012 against the accused for the offences under Sections 419, 420, 458, 468, 471, 120B r/w 34 IPC.

Now, the submission of both sides is that at the intervention of elders both the parties have entered into compromise in the civil suit—O.S.No.553 of 2014 on the file of XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad and they have also resolved their disputes in the present criminal proceedings at the intervention of elders and therefore, they may be permitted to enter into compromise and the Court may be pleased to record the compromise and quash the criminal proceedings in C.C.No.28 of 2012 on the file of XII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, City Criminal Courts, Hyderabad.

Having regard to the above said submission and considering the fact that it is a property dispute and parties have amicably settled their differences and no useful purpose will be served if they are driven to trial and following the decision reported in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another***^[1] this criminal petition is allowed and compromise is recorded as per the terms in the accompanying compromise petition and consequently the proceedings in C.C.No.28 of 2012 on the file of XII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, City Criminal Courts, Nampally, Hyderabad are hereby quashed.

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

U.DURGA PRASAD RAO, J

28-01-2015

Murthy

^[1] (2012) 10 SCC 303