



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Monday, the Twenty Ninth day of August Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Ms.Justice V.M.VELUMANI

CRL OP(MD) No.23679 of 2015

1 S. RAMALINGA SIVA
2 S. SIVANESAN
3 S. RAJALAKSHMI

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED 1 TO 3

Vs

1 THE STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION,
ODDANCHATHIRAM,
PALANI TALUK, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO. 26 OF 2013)

... 1ST RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

2 L. SUGUNA

... 2ND RESPONDENT/DEFACTO
COMPLAINANT

FOR PETITIONER : M/S.AL.KANNAN, ADVOCATE

FOR RESPONDENT : GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE (CRL. SIDE) FOR R1
FOR RESPONDENT : MR.D.VENKATESH ADVOCATE FOR R2

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.


ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, the petitioners and the *de-facto* complainant and her father are present before this Court. The petitioners handed over four Demand Drafts, bearing Nos.607319 to 607322, dated 30.07.2016, each for a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- [totally Rs.20,00,000/-], drawn on State Bank of India, Palani Branch, in favour of L.Sugana, the second respondent herein and two sovereigns of gold chain and one sovereign of gold ring to the *de-facto* complainant/second respondent and her father and also the R.C. Book in respect of the vehicle bearing Registration No.TN-38-AZ-8735 [Maruti Alto Car]. The second respondent and her father have also received the same.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners filed Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15403 of 2016, to quash the FIR in Crime No.26 of 2013 on the file of the first respondent police and this Court, vide order dated 29.08.2016 (today), quashed the said

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

3. Both parties and the learned counsel for the petitioners and the *de-facto* complainant submitted that, as per the compromise memo, entered into between the parties, dated 25.01.2016, they have settled



the matter amicably and further, H.M.O.P.No.22 of 2016 filed by the parties for divorce is posted to 01.09.2016, for judgment. Learned counsel for the *de-facto* complainant submitted that M.C.No.7 of 2013 filed by her was dismissed as withdrawn.

4. Since now it is reported that this Court, by its order dated 29.08.2016, passed in Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15403 of 2016, has quashed the FIR in Crime No.26 of 2013, there being no criminal proceedings pending against the petitioners, no further order is required. The compromise memo, dated 25.01.2016, shall form part of this order. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is closed.

sd/-
29/08/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

TO

1. THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, OTTANCHANTHIRAM.
 2. DO THRO THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, DINDIGUL.
 3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
ALL WOMEN POLICE STATION, ODDANCHATHIRAM,
PALANI TALUK, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
 4. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
- + 1 CC TO MR.D.VENKATESH, ADVOCATE IN SR No. 48304
+ 1 CC TO MR.AL.KANNAN, ADVOCATE IN SR No. 47892

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.23679 of 2015
Date :29/08/2016

SMN2
TE/PV/SAR-I : 02/09/2016 : 2P/7C
Encl.: Xerox copy of Compromise Memo