



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 10.11.2017

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **S.S.SUNDAR**

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.15326 of 2017

- 1.Vincent Jeyakumar
- 2.Mary @ Dhanam Mary
- 3.Anthonymmal
- 4.Reeta
- 5.Krishnan
- 6.Kulanthai @ Kulanthaisamy
- 7.Divyananthan
- 8.Amala Pushpam
- 9.Leema
- 10.John @ John Kennady
- 11.Manmadhan
- 12.Soosai Manickam
- 13.Nayagam

... Petitioners

-Vs-

1. The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thiruvadanai, Ramand District. ...1st Respondent/Complainant
2. Sahaya Sasikala ...2nd Respondent
/ De-facto complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records pertaining to Crime No.15 of 2015 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioner	: Mr.D.Venkatesh
For R1	: Mr.A.Ramar
	Additional Public Prosecutor
For R2	: Mr.T.Lenin Kumar

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the case in Crime No.15 of 2015 on the file of the first respondent



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

3. The petitioners are accused No.1 to 13 in Crime No.15 of 2015. Based on the complaint lodged by the second respondent, as against the petitioners, a case was registered in Crime No.15 of 2015 for the alleged offences under Sections 498(A) and 494 IPC.

4. It appears that the parties have settled their dispute amicably, at the intervention of friends and relatives and they have also entered into a compromise. A Joint Compromise Memo, signed by both parties, in the presence of their respective counsel, is also produced before this Court. As per the Joint Compromise Memo, the de-facto complainant, namely, the second respondent has no objection for quashing the first information report in Crime No.15 of 2015.

5. Today, the parties 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. In view of 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 the First Information Report in Crime No.15 of 2015, on the file of the Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Thiruvadanai, Ramand 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 (CS-I)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

Encl: Xerox copy of Compromise memo

1. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thiruvadanai, Ramand District.



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

WEB COPY

+ 1 cc TO Mr.D.Venkatesh , Advocate in SR No. 86455

cmr

AE/SV MMS/SAR1/21.11.2017/3P/4C

CrI.O.P.(MD) No.15326 of 2017
10.11.2017