



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : **26.07.2021**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **G.ILANGOVAN**

Crl.O.P(MD)No.9434 of 2021

and

Crl.M.P(MD).No.4815 of 2021

WEB COPY

1.S.Alexandar

2.Susai Manickam

3.Sahayamary

.. Petitioners/Accused No 1 to 3

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Police,
Thiruvadanai Police Station,
Thiruvadanai,
Ramanathapuram District.
(Crime No 43/2019)

..1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Arnica Nivetha

..2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records relating to the impugned FIR in Crime No.43 of 2019 on the file of 1st respondent and quash the same in so far as the petitioner's concern.

For Petitioners	:	Mr.R.Manickam
For Respondents	:	Mr.R.M.Anbunithi for R1 Additional Public Prosecutor Mr.S.Muniyandi for R2

ORDER

Heard both sides.

2.This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.43 of 2019, on the file of the respondent police, for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 294(b), 506(ii) and 352 of IPC.

3.The second respondent / defacto complainant as well as the petitioners/accused in both Criminal Original Petitions are present before this Court and they are identified by the respective learned counsel and both the parties have filed joint compromise memos stating that the matters in issue between them has been amicably resolved and therefore, the second respondent / defacto complainant is not willing to prosecute the case and therefore would pray for quashing the FIRs.



4. The compromise memos are filed before this Court and the parties are also present at the learned Additional Public Prosecutor office and their identity has also been verified through video conference. Since the matters in issue has been compromised between the parties, after hearing the parties through Video Conferencing, it was noticed that the first petitioner and the second respondent were separated because of the difference of opinion. The mother of the defacto complainant has also appeared before this Court through Video Conferencing and submitted that because of the difference of opinion between the first petitioner and the defacto complainant separated within a day from the date of marriage.

5.The second respondent/defacto complainant did not want any claim with regard to the maintenance from the first petitioner in future also. No purpose will be served in keeping the First Information Report pending.

6.In the result, by recording the compromise, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the proceedings in Crime No.43 of 2019, on the file of the first respondent police are quashed. The joint compromise memos shall form part and parcel of this order. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Records)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

tta

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.

ENCL: Xerox Copy of joint Compromise Memo

To:

1.The Inspector of Police,
Thiruvadanai Police Station,
Thiruvadanai,
Ramanathapuram District.

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

Crl.O.P(MD)No.9434 of 2021
26.07.2021

TP(CO)

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices> 2P 3C