



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.12675 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 25.07.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL.O.P (MD) No.12675 of 2022

Megadharshini

... Petitioner/ Sole Accused

Vs

1. The State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
T.Kallupatti Police Station,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.247 of 2017)

... 1st Respondent/ Complainant

2. Lakshmi

... 2nd Respondent/ Defacto complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records and quash the entire proceedings in STC No. 351 of 2021, on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Perayur.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.S.Parthiban

For R1 : Mr.A.Albert James
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For R2 : Mr.R.Devaraj



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.12675 of 2022

ORDER

WEB COPY

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in S.T.C No.351 of 2021, on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Perayur, in Crime No.247 of 2017 for the offences punishable under Sections 448, 323, 294(b) and 506(i) I.P.C, on the file of the first respondent Police.

2.The case is under trial. By passage of time, the parties have decided to bury their hatchet and compromise the dispute amicably among themselves.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the defacto complainant and the accused person are relatives. They settled the matter out of the Court and they have filed a Joint Memo of Compromise before this Court which have been signed by the petitioner and the second respondent and also by their respective counsel. The petitioner and the second respondent were also present in person before this Court and they were identified by the learned Government Advocate and Mr.Pa.Ilangovan,



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.12675 of 2022

SSI of Police, T.Kallupatti Police Station, Madurai District. This Court also enquired both the parties and was satisfied that the parties have come to an amicable settlement between themselves.

4. 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 offences punishable under Sections 448, 323, 294(b) and 506(i) I.P.C.

5. 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.

6. 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 S.T.C.No.351 of 2021 pending before the Judicial Magistrate Court, Perayur, even though, the offences involved are not compoundable in nature.



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.12675 of 2022

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and as a sequel, the proceedings in S.T.C.No.351 of 2021, on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Perayur is quashed and the terms of joint compromise memo shall form part and parcel of this order.

25.07.2022

Internet: Yes./No
Index: Yes/no
ebsi

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court,
Perayur.
2. The Inspector of Police,
T.Kallupatti Police Station,
Madurai District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.12675 of 2022

V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

ebsi

ORDER IN
CRL.O.P (MD) No.12675 of 2022

25.07.2022