



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 25.10.2016

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.20423 of 2016

1.Manikandan
2.Saraswathi

.. Petitioners/A1&A2

Vs.

1.State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Koodankulam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

.. Respondent/Complainant

2.Sangu Ganesan

.. Respondent/defacto
complainant

Prayer: Petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure to call for the records pertaining to Crime No.151 of 2016 on the file of the 1st respondent and quash the same in so far as the petitioners concerned.


For Petitioners	: Mr.D.Venkatesh
For R1	: Mr.K.Anbarasan
	Govt. Advocate (Crl.Side)
For R2	: Mr.T.Lenin Kumar

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the First Information Report registered in Crime No.151 of 2016 on the file of the first respondent.

2. It is seen that the case in Crime No.151 of 2016 for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 307 and 506(ii) of I.P.C., on the file of the first respondent, has been registered against the petitioners.

3.The second respondent/defacto complainant, gave a complaint against the petitioners/A1 and A2 in Crime No.151 of 2016 alleging that due to family dispute between them, at the instigation of the first petitioner, the second petitioner attacked the defacto complainant and threatened him with dire consequences.



4. When the matter is taken up for hearing, the petitioners and the second respondent/*defacto* complainant appeared in person and their identifications were also verified by this Court, in addition to the confirmation of the identity of the parties by the learned Government Advocate (Cr1.Side) through the respondent police.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the second respondent/*defacto* complainant would submit that the dispute is now compromised between the parties out of the Court.

6. Further, learned counsel appearing for the second respondent filed a memo of compromise dated 19.10.2016, duly stating that since the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement by way of compromise among themselves, the second respondent has no objection to withdraw the above case in Crime No.151 of 2016, pending on the file of the first respondent.

7. Hence, in view of memo of compromise dated 19.10.2016, this Court is of the opinion that it can safely be said that no useful purpose would be served in keeping the matter pending.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the entire proceedings in Crime No.151 of 2016, on the file of the first respondent police in respect of the petitioners accused is hereby quashed.

Sd/
Assistant Registrar(C.O.,)

/TRUE COPY/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Inspector of Police, Koodankulam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

+1cc to M/s.D.Venkatesh, Advocate, in SR No.63521.

Cr1.O.P. (MD) No.20423 of 2016
25.10.2016

pjl
msm/sk-skn/15.11.16/p2/4c