



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 25.01.2018

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.RAJAMANICKAM

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.1074 of 2018

1.Dr.V.Duraisamy
2.Saroja

..Petitioners/ Accused Nos. 2 & 3

-Vs-

1.State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Srirangam All Women Police Station,
Trichy District.
(Cr.No.12 of 2015)

... Respondent/ Complainant

2.Dr.Meenakumari

... Respondent/ Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the entire records and quash the entire proceedings in C.C.No.53 of 2016 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Trichirappalli against the petitioners.

For Petitioners :Mr.T.Senthil Kumar


For Respondents :Mr.A.P.G.Ohm Chairma Prabhu
Government Advocate (Crl.side)
for R1
:Mr.P.Jeyasankar
For R2

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to call for the entire records in C.C.No.53 of 2016 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Trichirappalli and quash the same.

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

<https://hcservices.ecourt.gov.in/pcservices/> 3.The petitioners are accused Nos. 2 & 3 in Crime No.12 of 2015. Based on the complaint lodged by the second respondent, a case was registered for the offences punishable under Sections 294 (b),



506 (i) IPC and Section 4 of TamilNadu Women Harassment Act and charge sheet also has been filed. Based on the said charge sheet the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Trichirappalli has taken the case on file as C.C.No.53 of 2016 and the same is pending.

WEB COPY

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 proceedings in C.C.No.53 of 2016 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Trichirappalli against the accused Nos.2 and 3 alone.

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 Government Advocate (Crl.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 purpose will be served by keeping this matter pending. Hence the proceedings in C.C.No.53 of 2016 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Trichirappalli, against the accused Nos.2 and 3 alone, 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-III)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

Herewith enclosed the xerox copy of Joint Compromise Memo

To

- 1.The learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Trichirappalli.
 - 2.The Inspector of Police, Srirangam All Women Police Station, Trichy District.
 - 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.
- +1CC to Mr.T.Senthil Kumar, Advocate, SR.No. 44372

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.1074 of 2018

25.01.2018