



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 05.10.2017

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.S.SUNDARCrl.O.P.(MD) No.12571 of 2017 and
Crl.M.P(MD).Nos.8650 and 8651 of 2017

Ponmanaselvan

... Petitioner / accused no.3

-Vs-

1. State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
S.S.Colony Police Station,
Madurai City,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.571 of 2016)... 1st Respondent /Complainant

2.Muniyandi

... 2nd respondent / De facto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the final report in connection with C.C.No.90 of 2017 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Madurai and quash the same.

For Petitioner	:	Mr. S. Senthil murugan
For R-1	:	Mr.K.S. Duraipandian
		Additional Public Prosecutor
For R-2	:	Mr.B. Vinothkumar

ORDER

This Criminal Original petition is filed to call for the final report in connection with C.C.No.90 of 2017 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Madurai and quash the same.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first respondent and the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent.

3. The petitioner is the accused no.3 in Criminal Proceedings in C.C.No.90 of 2017 on the file of the the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Madurai. On the basis of the complaint lodged by the second respondent / de facto complainant, a case was registered by the first respondent police in Crime No.571 of 2016 for the



offences under Sections 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC against the petitioner and others. Thereafter, the first respondent police has filed a charge sheet before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Madurai and the same was taken on file in C.C.No.90 of 2017.

4. It appears that parties viz., petitioner and the second respondent / de facto complainant have settled their dispute amicably out of Court, at the instigation of the elders and well wishers and they have also entered into a compromise. A joint compromise memo signed by the parties concerned in the presence of their respective counsels is produced before this Court.

5. As per the joint compromise memo, the petitioner and the second respondent, who have appeared before this Court have stated in unequivocal terms that the Joint Compromise Memo was signed by them 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 identity of the parties are also confirmed by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor through the first respondent Police.

6. In the Compromise Memo, the de facto complainant has agreed to withdraw the criminal case and the petitioner and the second respondent have requested this Court to quash the proceedings C.C.No.90 of 2017 on the file of the the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Madurai.

7. In the said circumstances, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose will be served by keeping this matter pending. Hence, on the basis of the compromise memo signed by the parties, the Criminal Original petition is allowed and the proceedings pending in C.C.No.90 of 2017 on the file of the the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Madurai is quashed insofar as the petitioner concerned. The Joint Compromise Memo signed by the parties shall form part of the order. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(Crl side)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

Encl: Xerox copy of Compromise memo

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.V, Madurai.

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

2. Do Info The Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Madurai.



3. The Inspector of Police,
S.S.Colony Police Station,
Madurai City,
Madurai District.

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

Trp
AE/MR KKR/SAR4/31.10.2017/3P/5C

Cr1.O.P. (MD) No.12571 of 2017
05.10.2017