



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 14.12.2020

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14424 of 2020

and

Crl.M.P(MD)No.6755 of 2020

WEB COPY

1)Kalimuthu @ Kalimuthuvel

(Name corrected as per the order dated 14.12.2020)

2)Bharath

3)Vetrivel

4)Subash

...Petitioners/Accused 1,2,4&6

vs.

1)The State rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

Koodankulam Police Station,

Tirunelveli District.

(Crime No.193 of 2017)

...Respondent/Complainant

2)Bala Praveen

... Respondent/Defacto Complainant

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, to call for the entire records pertaining to the case in Crime No.193 of 2017 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Koodankulam Police Station, Tirunelveli District and quash the same in respect of the petitioners.

For Petitioners

: Mr.A.Kesavan

For R1

: Mr.V.Neelakandan


Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to call for the entire records pertaining to the case in Crime No.193 of 2017 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Koodankulam Police Station, Tirunelveli District and quash the same in respect of the petitioners.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioners has filed an affidavit dated 14.12.2020 stating that the 1st petitioner's name is Kalimuthuvel, but in the FIR, his name has been mentioned as Kalimuthu and in the present petition also, it has been inadvertently mentioned as ''Kalimuthu'' instead of Kalimuthuvel. Thus, he would pray for correcting the 1st petitioner's name in the cause title. The above affidavit is taken on record and the 1st petitioner's name shall be read as Kalimuthu @ Kalimuthuvel instead of Kalimuthu.

3.The 2nd respondent / defacto complainant, as well as the
<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



petitioners/accused are present before this Court and they are identified by the respective learned counsel and both the parties have filed a joint compromise memo stating that the matter has been amicably resolved between themselves and the 2nd respondent / defacto complainant is not willing to prosecute the complaint and therefore, the petitioners would pray for quashing the FIR in Crime No.193/2017 on the file of 1st respondent police.

4.The compromise memo is filed before this Court and the parties along with their respective counsel are also personally present before this Court and the defacto complainant has represented before this Court that the matter has been settled amicably between the parties. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor who was present in the Court had also verified their identity and would state that he has no objection for the above compromise.

5.In the result, by recording the compromise, the Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the FIR in Crime No.193/2017 on the file of 1st respondent police, is quashed. The joint compromise memo shall form part and parcel of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

ENCL:Xerox Copy of Joint Compromise Memo

To

1)The Inspector of Police,
Koodankulam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

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

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.14424 of 2020
14.12.2020

MJ(CO)

KB(28.12.2020) 2P 3C