



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13285 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 22.07.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL.O.P (MD) No.13285 of 2022

1. Pavanasam,

2. Sankarganesh,

: Petitioners

Vs

1.State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Pathamadai Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
Crime.No. 34/2022.

2. Viswanathan,

: Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records relating to Crime No. 34 of 2022, dated 01.04.2022 on the file of first respondent police and to quash the same in so far as the petitioners are concerned.



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13285 of 2022

For Petitioners : M/s. Sathyachidambaram.S,
For R1 : Mr.A.Albert James,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
For R2 : Mr.K.V.Rajarajan

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No. 34 of 2022, on the file of first respondent police.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 31.03.2022, the petitioners trespassed into the defacto complainant's house and searched for one Ullipitchaiya, who is a relative of the second respondent. When the same was questioned by the defacto complainant, the petitioners abused him and also threatened with dire consequences. 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.



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13285 of 2022

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.S.Jesudas, Head Constable, Pathamada Police Station as well as by the learned Counsels appearing for the parties. 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 448, 294(b) and 506(ii) 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.



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13285 of 2022

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. 34 of 2022, on the file of 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. 34 of 2022, on the file of 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.

22.07.2022

Internet:Yes./No

Index:Yes/no

lr

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Pathamadai Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

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

4/5



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13285 of 2022

V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

lr

ORDER IN
CRL.O.P (MD) No.13285 of 2022

22.07.2022