



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.07..2021

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN

Crl.O.P.No.8929 of 2015
and MP No.1 of 2015

1. Srinivasan
2. V.Ramachandran
3. R.Jayalakshmi
4. B.Ravi @ Kannan
5. Anusya Ravi
6. Murugan
7. R.Kalaiselvi
8. N.S.Balasubramani
9. R.Parvathy

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The State rep by
The Inspector of Police
W8-All Women Police Station
Thirumangalam Police Station
Chennai.

2. Subashree

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records in Cr.No.9 of 2015 pending on the file of the 1st respondent police and quash the FIR as against the petitioners.

For Petitioners: Mr.J.Suresh

For Respondents: Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Counsel for Government (Crl.Side) for R1
Mr.C.V.Kumar for R2

ORDER

This petition is listed today under the caption 'for clarification' at the instance of the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent.

2. Initially, a petition, viz., Crl.O.P.No.21905 of 2018 was filed by Srinivasan / A.1 to quash the proceedings pending in



Crime No.9 of 2015. Mr.P.Sesubalan Raja, learned counsel had appeared on behalf of the petitioner and Ms.M.Prabhavathi, learned Additional Public Prosecutor had appeared on behalf of the 1st respondent and the petition was allowed in terms of compromise and the said Crime No.9 of 2015 against the said Srinivasan / A.1 alone was quashed on 11.09.2018.

3. Thereafter, the present petition, viz., CrI.O.P.No.8929 of 2015 has been filed again praying to quash the proceedings against the said Srinivasan as well as the relatives of said Srinivasan. When the present petition was taken up for hearing on 25.06.2021, taking note of the fact that the Crime No.9 of 2015 was quashed in respect of the 1st accused / Srinivasan, in view of memorandum of understanding dated 31.03.2015, this Court had quashed the proceedings in the said crime number with respect of all petitioners on 25.06.2021.

4. Now, Mr.C.V.Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent submits that he is the counsel representing before the court below and assisting the prosecution in the trial court and he is not aware of the compromise. The learned counsel also submits that later on, he should not be put into embracing situation for recording the same, as he is not the witness and signatory to the compromise memo.

The submission of Mr.C.V.Kumar, learned counsel for the 2nd respondent is recorded and the said petition is clarified accordingly.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ssd
To

1. The Inspector of Police
W8-All Women Police Station
Thirumangalam Police Station
Chennai.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras,
Chennai.

CrI.O.P.No.8929 of 2015
and M.P No.1 of 2015

NR(CO)
PM(28/07/2021)