



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 14.06.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.BHARATHIDASAN

CrI.O.P. (MD) No.8242 of 2019

WEB COPY

1.Ranjith

2.M.Livingston

: Petitioners/Accused No.1&2

Versus

1. The State

Rep. by Inspector of Police,
Kuruvikulam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.2 of 2019).

: Respondent/Complainant

2. Gunarathinam

: Respondent/Defacto
Complainant

Prayer: Petition is filed under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code praying to quash the FIR in Crime No.2 of 2019, dated 05.01.2019 pending on the file of the first respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Sankar

For Respondent No.1 : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi,
Government Advocate (CrI.side)

For Respondent No.2 : Mr.R.Amarnath

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the First Information Report registered in Crime No.2 of 2019, dated 05.01.2019 pending on the file of the first respondent police.

2. The petitioners are accused Nos.1 and 2 in Crime No.2 of 2019 registered for the offences under Sections 294(b), 324, 506(i) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002, based on the complaint given by the second respondent/defacto complainant. The second respondent/defacto complainant is none other than the wife of the first petitioner and the sister of the second petitioner.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent jointly submitted that there is a dispute between the family members and now, they have settled the dispute between themselves amicably and the second respondent/defacto complainant is not willing to proceed further with the criminal case.

4. Today, when the matter was taken up for hearing, both the petitioners and the second respondent/defacto complainant are present in Court and they are identified by their respective



counsel. When the Court enquired the second respondent/*defacto* complainant, she has stated that only out of frustration, the complaint has been given against the petitioners and now, the dispute has been amicably settled and they are living together peacefully and they have also filed a joint compromise memo.

WEB COPY

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the relationship of the parties and now, they have amicably settled their dispute between themselves and they are living together peacefully, there is no purpose in proceeding with the criminal case. In the above circumstances, the criminal proceedings is liable to be quashed.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners in Crime No.2 of 2019 on the file of the first respondent police, is quashed.

sd/
Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Encl.:Xerox Copy of Joint Compromise Memo

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Kuruvikulam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 CC to Mr.K.SANKAR, Advocate (SR-68748[F] dated 14/06/2019)

Order made in
Cr1.O.P. (MD) No.8242 of 2019
Dated: 14.06.2019

SML

MK (25.06.2019) 2P 4C