



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 27.11.2017

CORAM

WEB COPY

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

CrI.O.P.(MD) No. 16244 of 2017

1.A.Jameer Abubakkar

2.Mohamed Asrath Khan

3.Riyaz Ahamad

4.M.Mohamed Isham ...Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 4

-Vs-

1. State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Paramakudi Police Station,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.
(Crime No.678 of 2017)

...1st Respondent/Complainant

2. Vengatesh

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto
Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records relating to the impugned FIR in Cr.No.678 of 2017 dated 03.11.2017 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.N.Oli Mohammed

For R1 : Mr.K.S.Durai Pandian
Additional Public Prosecutor

For R2 : Mr.A.Arputharaj

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to call for the records relating to the impugned FIR in Cr.No.678 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent police and to quash the same.

<https://hcservices.courts.gov.in/hcservices/>
2.11.2017 The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners,
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 4 in Crime No. 678 of 2017. Based on the complaint lodged by the second respondent, a case was registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 323 and 324 IPC.

4. It appears that the petitioners 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 their relatives. 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 FIR in Cr.No. 678 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 police.

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 FIR in Cr.No.678 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent / The Inspector of Police, Paramakudi Town Police Station, Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram 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

Encl: Xerox Copy of Joint Compromise Memo

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Paramakudi Town Police Station,
Paramakudi,

<https://hcservicereports.phila.gov/services> District.



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

WEB COPY

+1cc to Mr.A.Arputharaj, Advocate Sr.No.89461

CMR

VB/KK/SAR3/12/12/2017/3P/4C

Cr1.O.P.(MD) No. 16244 of 2017
27.11.2017