



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 12.07.2017

CORAM

WEB COPY

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

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.8770 of 2017

1. Kannan
2. Murali
3. Moorthy @ Rethinamoorthy
4. Prabhu

...Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4

-Vs-

1. The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
B-1 Town Police Station,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.
(Crime No.254 of 2016)

... Respondent/Complainant

2. Selvam

... Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for records pertaining to the First Information Report in Crime No.254 of 2016, dated 03.06.2016 on the file of the first respondent for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 506(i) of I.P.C., r/w Section 3 of Tamilnadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage & Loss) Act and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioners : Mr.D.Balamurugapandi
For R-1 : Mr.K.Anbarasan,
Government Advocate(Crl.side).
For R-2 : Mr.M.Vignesh Kumar

O R D E R

This Criminal Original petition is filed only for quashing First Information Report in Crime No.254 of 2016, dated 03.06.2016 on the file of the first respondent for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 506(i) of I.P.C., r/w Section 3 of Tamilnadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage & Loss) Act.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate(Criminal side) appearing for the first respondent and the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent.

<https://hcservices.courts.gov.in/hcservices/> basis of the complaint received from the second respondent/defacto complainant, a case was registered by the first respondent in Crime No.254 of 2016, dated 03.06.2016 for the



offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 506(i) of I.P.C., r/w Section 3 of Tamilnadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage & Loss) Act.

4. After the complaint, at the instigation of well wishers and relatives, the petitioners and the defacto complainant have entered into a compromise outside Court. In the Joint Compromise Memo, it is stated that the defacto complainant has no objection for quashing the First Information Report in Crime No.254 of 2016, dated 03.06.2016.

5. The petitioners/accused and the second respondent/defacto complainant appeared before this Court and submitted, 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 identities of the parties are also confirmed by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) through the first respondent police. In the Compromise Memo, the second respondent has stated that he has no objection for quashing the First Information Report in Crime No.254 of 2016, dated 03.06.2016.

6. 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 First Information Report in Crime No.254 of 2016, dated 03.06.2016 on the file of the first respondent is quashed in toto and 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(RTI)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar.

Encl:

Joint Compromise Memo xerox was attached.

To

1. The Inspector of Police, B-1 Town Police Station,
Ramanathapuram, Ramanathapuram District.

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

+1CC to Mr.D.Balamuruga Pandi, Advocate, SR.No. 64803

CrI.O.P.(MD) No.8770 of 2017

12.07.2017