



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 15.03.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **P.RAJAMANICKAM**

Cr1.O.P.(MD) No.3661 of 2018

1.Kannan @ Ramani Kannan

2.Balamurugan

...Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 2

-Vs-

1. The State represented by,  
The Inspector of Police,  
Thoothukudi South Police Station,  
Thoothukudi,  
Thoothukudi District.

(Crime No.665 of 2016) ...1<sup>st</sup> Respondent/Complainant

2.Murugan

... 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent/De-facto Complainant

**Prayer:** Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records and quash the F.I.R. In Crime No.665 of 2016 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Thoothukudi South Police Station, Thoothukudi, Thoothukudi District, pursuant to the compromise arrived at by the parties.

For Petitioners : Mr.A.Thiruvadi Kumar

For R-1 : Mr.A.P.G.Ohm Chairma Prabhu  
Government Advocate

For R-2 : Mr.S.Vinayak

\*\*\*

### **ORDER**

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to call for the records and quash the F.I.R. In Crime No.665 of 2016 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Thoothukudi South Police Station, Thoothukudi, Thoothukudi District, pursuant to the compromise arrived at by the parties.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/> 2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, learned Government Advocate (Cr1.side) appearing for the first respondent and the learned counsel appearing for the second



respondent.

3.The petitioners are accused Nos.1 and 2 in Crime No.665 of 2016. Based on the complaint lodged by the second respondent, a case was registered for the offences punishable under Sections 294 (b), 324 and 506(ii) 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 and also filed an affidavit along with a joint compromise memo, dated 05.02.2018. 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 Crime No. 665 of 2016 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 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 FIR in Crime No.665 of 2016 on the file of the first respondent / the Inspector of Police, Thoothukudi South Police Station, Thoothukudi,, 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(CO)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

Encl: Xerox copy of Joint Compromise Memo  
To

1. The Inspector of Police,  
<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>  
Thoothukudi South Police Station,  
Thoothukudi, Thoothukudi District..



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

+ 1 cc TO Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar , Advocate in SR No. 55597

Ls

AE/SKN RSK/SAR4/04.04.2018/3P/4C

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3661 of 2018  
15.03.2018