



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 14.12.2017

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.S.SUNDAR

CRL OP (MD) No.15123 of 2017

1. Dhanasekaran
2. Karthigairaj
3. Nagaraj
4. Govindan
5. Shanmugasekar
6. Kuppmuthu
7. Veeraprakash

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 7

Vs.

1. The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Emaneshwaram Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District. ... Respondent /Complainant
(Crime No.96 of 2012)

2.M.Boominathan

... Respondent/
De-facto Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for records pertaining to Crime No.96 of 2012 on the file of the first respondent and to quash the same.


For Petitioners	: Mr.A.Ramalingam
For R-1	: Mr.K.S.Durai Pandiyan, Additional Public Prosecutor.
For R-2	: Mr.P.Sathya Moorthy

O R D E R

This Criminal Original petition is filed for quashing the First Information Report in Crime No.96 of 2012 on the file of the first respondent.

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

3.The petitioners are accused Nos.1 to 7 in Crime No.96 of 2012 on the file of the first respondent police. On the basis of the complaint lodged by the second respondent/de-facto complainant, a case was registered in Crime No.96 of 2012, dated 09.07.2012, for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294 (b), 323, 324 and 307 of I.P.C.



4. It appears that the parties, namely, the petitioners and the second respondent have settled their dispute amicably out of Court, at the intervention of elders and relatives. It is stated that the parties also have entered into a compromise. A Joint Compromise Memo, dated 06.11.2017, signed by the petitioners and the de-facto complainant in the presence of their respective counsels is produced before this Court. As per the Joint Compromise memo, the defacto complainant has agreed for quashing the First Information Report in Crime No.96 of 2012 on the file of the first respondent.

5. The parties, namely, the petitioners and the second respondent appeared before this Court and expressed in unequivocal terms that they have signed the Joint Compromise Memo on their own free will and volition. The identity 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. Having regard to the specific terms of the Joint Compromise Memo, this Court is of the view that no useful or fruitful purpose will be served by keeping this matter pending. Hence, on the basis of the Joint Compromise Memo signed by the parties, the Criminal Original petition is allowed and the First Information Report in Crime No.96 of 2012 on the file of the first respondent, is quashed in *toto*. The Joint Compromise Memo signed by the parties shall form part of the order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-II)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

Encl: Xerox Copy of Joint Compromise Memo

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Emaneshwaram Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

+1cc to Mr.A.Ramalingam, Advocate Sr.No.93448

PMU

VB/JC/SAR2/18/01/2018/2P/4C