



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 28.07.2021

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE G.ILANGO VAN

Crl.OP(MD)No.4148 of 2021

WEB COPY

1.Thangaraj
2.Jeganathan
3.Mageshwari

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.1to 3/
Accused 1 to 3

vs.

1.State Rep by the
Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No. 22 of 2018)

... 1st Respondent/ Complainant/
Complainant

2.Manimegalai

... 2nd Respondent/LW-1/Defacto
Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to call for entire records pursuant to the charge sheet in C.C.No.50 of 2019 on the file of the Special Court for Land Grabbing, Madurai and quash the same.


For Petitioners	: Mr.S.Gokulraj
For R1	: Mr.R.M.Anbunithi, Additional Public Prosecutor
For R2	: M/s.S.Prabha

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the charge sheet in C.C.No.50 of 2019 on the file of the Special Court for Land Grabbing, Madurai.

2. The defacto complainant and her daughter appeared through video conference from the Office of the Public Prosecutor and made a submission that since the petitioners and they are close relative, they gave consent to live one roof.

3.The contention of the petitioner is that based on the complaint lodged by the second respondent, the first respondent registered a case in Crime No. 22 of 2018 for the offences punishable under Sections 120 (B), 420, 468 and 471 of Indian Penal Code, against the petitioners.



4.The further contention of the petitioners is that they compromised the issue with the second respondent amicably. A joint memo of compromise is filed, which has been duly signed by the petitioners and the second respondent and also by their respective counsels.

WEB COPY

5.The petitioners and the second respondent appeared through video conference with their respective counsels and also produced their Aadhar cards before this Court. They were also identified by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor and Mr.Bakiyasamy, Sub-Inspector of Police, District Crime Branch, Dindigul District. Both the parties to compromise were enquired by me and they accepted the terms of compromise. Hence the Compromise Memo is recorded.

6. Considering the totality of the circumstances, the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner and also in view of the joint compromise memo, dated 08.03.2021, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose will be served by keeping the matter pending.

7.In the result, the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and the entire proceedings in C.C.No.50 of 2019 on the file of the Special Court for Land Grabbing, Madurai, is hereby quashed in respect of the petitioners and the terms of joint compromise memo shall form part of this order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-I)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

dss

Note: In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

To

Encl.Joint Compromise Memo.

1.The Special Court for Land Grabbing,
Madurai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Dindigul District.



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

+1 CC to M/s.S.PRABHA, Advocate (SR-24483[F] dated 29/07/2021)

+1 CC to M/s.S.GOKULRAJ, Advocate (SR-24484[F] dated 29/07/2021)

**CrI.OP(MD)No.4148 of 2021
28.07.2021**

RK (09.08.2021) 3P 6C