



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 20.11.2017

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.S.SUNDAR

Cr1.O.P.(MD) No. 15803 of 2017

Sudalaimani

...Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Koodankulam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.277 of 2017)

2.Mariapushpam

... Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the entire records pertaining to the case in Cr.No.277 of 2017 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Koodankulam Police Station, Tirunelveli District and quash the same.

For Petitioner	: Mr.A.Kesavan
For R1	: Mr.K.S.Durai Pandian Additional Public Prosecutor
For R2	: Mr.Thinakaran

ORDER


The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to call for the entire records pertaining to the case in Cr.No.277 of 2017 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Koodankulam Police Station, Tirunelveli District and to quash the same.

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

3.The petitioner is the sole accused in Cr.No.277 of 2017. Based on the complaint lodged by the second respondent, a case was registered by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b) and 506(ii) IPC and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002.

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

4.It appears that the petitioner and the second respondent,



namely, the de-facto complainant have settled their dispute amicably out of Court and they have also entered into a compromise, on the advise of elders and well wishers. 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 complaint in Cr.No.277 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent.

5.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.

6.Having regard to the specific terms of the Joint Compromise Memo, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose will be served by keeping this matter pending. Hence the complaint in Cr.No.277 of 2017, on the file of the first respondent / The Inspector of Police, Koodankulam Police Station, Tirunelveli 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(P & A)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

Encl:Xerox copy of Compromise Memo

1.The Inspector of Police,
Koodankulam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

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

+1cc to M/s.A.KESAVAN Advocate in SR. No. 88028

MM

JS/JC/SAR.2/4.12.2017/2P-4C

Cr1.O.P.(MD) No. 15803 of 2017
20.11.2017