

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.07.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE RMT.TEEKAA RAMAN

Crl.OP.No.20826 of 2014

and

M.P.Nos.1 and 2 of 2014

1.Syed Dasthagir Rafi
2.Syed Rafi
3.Gulzar Begum
4.Ayisha @ Sulika
5.Hajira @ Hajira Begum
6.Hamshed Begum Petitioners/Accused 1 to 6

...Vs...

1. State Rep by:-
Inspector of Police,
H-1, Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai - 600 021.
2. Shabana Banu Respondents/Complainant &
Defacto Complainant

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records in C.C.No.584 of 2014 on the file of Learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai for the offence under Section 420,494,498(A) & 506(ii) of I.P.C and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.V.Thillai Kumar

For R1 : Mr.B.Ramesh Babu,
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

R2 : Mr.T.Kumaravijayan

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed praying to call for the records in C.C.No.584 of 2014 on the file of Learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai for the offence under Section 420,494,498(A) & 506(ii) of I.P.C and quash the same.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner and the second respondent are present. The parties viz the first petitioner and the second respondent are present and they are identified

by the respective counsel and also produced the original Aadhar Card and the Driving License of the second respondent. They filed a memo stating that the second respondent on the advise of the elders has compromised the matter and now they settled the issue. When this Court puts to the second respondent/defacto-complainant Shabana Banu reason for compromise, she has expressed that they have planned to re-union. The statement made by her is hereby recorded.

3. The first petitioner is the husband of the second respondent and the petitioners 2 to 6 are the relatives of the first petitioner. Both the defacto-complainant/second respondent and petitioners have presented the memo as stated above that the matter was compromised between themselves. The second respondent /defacto-complainant has specifically stated that she is not pressing the complaint given by her in Crime No.622 of 2012, H1 Washermenpet Police Station, in which, charge sheet has been filed in C.C.No.584 of 2014, XV Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai. The petitioner and respondent signed the memo attested by the respondent counsel and joint compromise memo filed by the petitioners and the defacto-complainant is taken on file and recorded.

4. In view of the fact that the defacto-complainant has expressed that, she is proposed a plan for re-union with the first petitioner herein and also the compromise arrived, no useful purpose will be served in prosecuting the C.C.No.584 of 2014.

5. Accordingly, based upon the memo, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the final report filed in C.C.No.584 of 2014 on the file of the XVth Metropolitan Magistrate Court, George Town, Chennai relating to Crime No.622 of 2012, H1 Washermenpet Police Station stands hereby quashed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CCC)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

nvi

To

1.The XV Metropolitan Magistrate,
George Town, Chennai.


2.The Inspector of Police,
H-1, Washermenpet Police Station,
Chennai - 600 021.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

+2cc's to Mr.T.Kumaravijayan, Advocate, S.R.No.50529

CrI.O.P.No.20826 of 2014
and
M.P.Nos.1 and 2 of 2014

AR CCC
CA(01/08/2017)



WEB COPY