



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 27.07.2017

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.S.SUNDARCrl.O.P.(MD)No.9823 of 2017

1. Dinesh
2. Anand
3. Balasundaram
4. Siva Bharathi
5. Rejinkumar
6. Murugan

... Petitioners/
Accused Nos.1 to 6

-Vs-

1. The State Represented by
The Sub Inspector of Police,
B-1 Town Police Station,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.
(In Crime No.224 of 2013) ... 1st Respondent/Complainant
2. Mani ... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original petition is filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records relating to the impugned First Information Report in Crime No.224 of 2013 on the file of the first respondent and to quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Sanjai Gandhi

For R-1 : Mr.K.Anbarasan,
Government Advocate(Crl.side).

For R-2 : Mr.D.Anbarasu

O R D E R

This Criminal Original petition is filed for quashing the First Information Report in Crime No.224 of 2013 on the file of the first respondent.



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.

WEB COPY

3. The petitioners are the accused Nos.1 to 6 in Crime No.224 of 2013 on the file of the first respondent police for the alleged offence under Sections 147, 294(b), 341 and 353 of I.P.C.

4. Pursuant to the registration of the criminal case, it appears that the second respondent/defacto complainant and the petitioners have entered into a compromise, on the advise of the elders and well wishers. As per the Joint Compromise Memo, dated 20.07.2017, the parties have stated that they have settled their dispute amicably with an intention to lead a peaceful life and both the parties have agreed that the criminal proceedings in Crime No.224 of 2013 on the file of the first respondent can be quashed.

5. The parties appeared today before this Court and expressed in unequivocal terms that the Compromise Memo signed by them was 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 Government Advocate (Criminal side) 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 and fruitful purpose will be served by keeping this matter pending. Hence, the Criminal Original petition is allowed and on the basis of the Compromise Memo signed by the parties, the First Information Report in Crime No.224 of 2013 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.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(C.O)

/True Copy/

Sub-Assistant Registrar

(*) COMPROMISE MEMO XEROX COPY IS ENCLOSED HEREWITH

To

1. The Sub Inspector of Police, B-1 Town Police Station, Ramanathapuram, Ramanathapuram District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

Pmu

<https://hcds.court.gov.in/cas/17/8/2017>

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.9823 of 2017

27.07.2017