



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 18.09.2017

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.S.SUNDAR

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.12225 of 2017

Ponseelan

...Petitioner/Sole Accused

-Vs-

1. The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Sayarpuram Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.
(In Crime No.162 of 2017)

...1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Rajaram

... 2nd Respondent/De-facto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records relating to FIR in Crime No.162 of 2017 dated 22.08.2017 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Sayarpuram Police Station, Thoothukudi District and quash the same.


For Petitioner	:Mr.S.Dheenadhayalan
For R-1	:Mr.K.Anbarasan, Government Advocate(Crl.side).
For R-2	:Mr.K.G.Arun Kumar

O R D E R

This Criminal Original petition has been filed to quash the records relating to FIR in Crime No.162 of 2017 dated 22.08.2017 on the file of the first respondent police.

2.Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate(Criminal side) appearing for the first respondent and the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent.

3.On the basis of complaint given by the second respondent, against the petitioner, a case was registered in Crime No.162 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 387, 307 and 506(ii) of



4.It appears that on the advise of elders and friends, the petitioner and the second respondent have agreed to compromise the matter out of Court. A Joint Compromise Memo, signed by the both parties, in the presence of their respective counsels, is also produced before this Court. As per the Joint Compromise Memo, the dispute between the petitioner and the de-facto complainant is relating to money transaction and that there was only a wordy quarrel between the petitioner and the de-facto complainant on the date of occurrence. The de-facto complainant, namely, the second respondent has given his consent to quash the entire proceedings in Cr.No.162 of 2017.

5.The parties appeared before this Court and expressed in unequivocal terms that they have signed the Joint Compromise Memo on their own will and volition. The identities of the parties are verified with reference to the authenticated documents produced by the parties before this Court. The identities of the parties are also confirmed by the learned Government Advocate(Criminal side) through the first respondent police.

6.Having regard to the compromise arrived at between the parties, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose will be served by keeping this matter pending. As per the Compromise Memo signed by the parties, the de-facto complainant, namely, the second respondent has agreed to quash the proceedings against the petitioners. Hence the First Information Report in Cr.No.162 of 2017 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Sayarpuram Police Station, Thoothukudi District, is quashed in toto. The Joint Compromise Memo signed by the parties shall form part of the order.

7.Accordingly, the Criminal Original petition is allowed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(Crl.Side)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar.

Herewith enclosed the copy of Joint compromise Memo

To

1 The Inspector of Police, Sayarpuram Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.

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

+1CC to Mr.D.Deenadhayalan, Advocate, SR.No. 79417

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.12225 of 2017