



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 13.06.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL.O.P (MD) No.10159 of 2022

WEB COPY

1. Sathish @ Jilla,

2. Muthukumar,

3. Chandru,

4. Surya,

5. Sonai @ Sonaipandian,

: Petitioners

Vs

1. The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Thiruppuvanam Police Station,
Sivagangai District.
Crime No. 277 of 2021.

2. Rajesh,

: Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records pertaining to the FIR in Crime.No. 277 of 2021 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same Accused No.1 to 5.

For Petitioners	: M/s. Ragunathan.G.,
For R1	: Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar,
	Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
For R2	: Mr.G.Balaji

O R D E R

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR in in Crime.No. 277 of 2021, for the offence under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC on the file of the first respondent police.

2.The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, there was a wordy quarrel between the petitioners and the defacto complainant. They also attacked the defacto complainant with knife and caused injuries. Hence the complaint.



3.The case is still at the stage of investigation. By passage of time, the parties have decided to bury their hatchet and compromise the dispute amicably among themselves.

4.A Joint Memo of Compromise has been filed before this Court which have been signed by the petitioners and the second respondent and also by their respective counsel. The petitioners and the second respondent were also present in person before this Court and they were identified by Mr.J.Santhana Raj, SSI of Police, Thiruppuvanam Police Station, Sivagangai District. This Court also enquired both the parties and was satisfied that the parties have come to an amicable settlement between themselves.

5.In the instant case, the dispute is of personal in nature and the parties had compromised. Where the parties have compromised the matter, the High Court has to power to quash the complaint for the offence under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC.

6.The legal position expressed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Panjab and another*** reported in ***(2012)10 SCC 303*** and ***Parbathbhai Aahir @ Parbathbhai Vs. State of Gujrath*** reported in ***(2017)9 SCC 641*** were taken into consideration.

7.In the light of the guidelines issued in the above said Judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court, no useful purpose will be served in keeping the proceedings in Crime No.277 of 2021 pending before the first respondent police, even though, the offences involved are not compoundable in nature.

8.Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and as a sequel, the proceedings in Crime No.277 of 2021 on the file of the first respondent police, is quashed insofar as the petitioners alone and the terms of joint compromise memo shall form part and parcel of this order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

// True Copy //

/06/2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Encl.: xerox copy of Joint Compromise memo.

lr



To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Thiruppuvanam Police Station,
Sivagangai District.

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

ORDER IN
CRL.O.P (MD) No.10159 of 2022
13.06.2022
(1/3)

SG(CO)

TR(27.06.2022) 3P 3C