

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE U. DURGA PRASAD RAO

Crl.P.M.P.No.1645 of 2015 in Crl.P.No.9263 of 2010

and

Criminal Petition No.9263 of 2010

COMMON ORDER:

The *defacto* complainant and her counsel Sri Damodar Rao are present. Accused and his Counsel Sri T.V.Ramana Rao are present.

The private complaint filed by the *defacto* complainant was forwarded by learned Judicial First Class Magistrate, Nirmal to the Police of Soan P.S who registered the case in Crime No.73 of 2010 against the accused for the offences under Sec.208, 209, 409, 417, 418, 420, 424, 482 and 511 IPC and investigation is reported to be pending.

The grievance of the complainant is that the accused sold him land admeasuring Ac.3-12 gts in S.No.201/3 of Old Pachampahad village in Four parts under an agreement of sale dated 25.03.2010 for Rs.2,50,000/- and later the complainant removed the bushes and levelled the land and brought into cultivation. Thereafter the accused got filed a suit for injunction against complainant in O.S.No.90 of 2010 through his daughter—Mounika in collusion with her stating as if she is the owner of the land. Since the accused being VRO, he manipulated records and got filed a false suit through his daughter to harass the complainant and to extract money from him. Hence the complaint.

While so, today both parties and their respective Counsel present in Court and submitted that at the intervention of elders they have amicably resolved all their disputes and the daughter of accused namely Mounika executed registered sale deed bearing No.3180/2014 dated 30.06.2014 in favour of the complainant and they also compromised the suit O.S.No.90 of 2010 pending on the file of Principal Junior Civil Judge, Nirmal before the Lok Adalat on 22.07.2014 and as such the complainant has no objection for

quashment of the proceedings in FIR No.73 of 2010 and hence this Court may be pleased to accord permission to them to compound the offence and quash the proceedings in the interest of justice.

Having regard to the above submission and in view of the fact that it is a property dispute between the complainant and accused which they have amicably resolved and the accused's daughter has already executed sale deed in favour of the complainant in respect of the disputed land and he has been put in possession of the same and further, no useful purpose will be served even if the investigation is ordered to be continued since the parties have compromised and following the decision reported in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another***, this petition is allowed and permission is accorded to the parties to compound the offence and consequently proceedings in Crime No.73 of 2010 of Soan P.S are quashed against the accused in the light of joint compromise memo filed by the parties.

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

Date: 27.04.2015

SCS