



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13810 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 01.08.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL.O.P (MD) No.13810 of 2022

1. R.Rathinam @ Rathinaeswaran,

2. N.Vetrivel @ Vetri,

: Petitioners

Vs

1. State represented through
The Inspector of Police,
Subramaniapuram Police Station,
Madurai City.
Cr.No.316/2022.

2. Ramamoorthy,

: Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records in Crime No.316 of 2022 on the file of the first respondent police and to quash the same against the petitioners



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13810 of 2022

For Petitioners :M/s. Balamurugan.P,
For R1 : Mr.A.Albert James,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
For R2 : Mr.J.David Ganesan

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR in 316 of 2022, on the file of the first respondent police.

2.The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, the accused persons stabbed the defacto complainant with knife and caused cut injuries in his hand. 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



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13810 of 2022

were also present in person before this Court and they were identified by Mr.R.Babu, SSI of Police, C2 Subramaniapuram Police Station, Madurai, 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, 324 and 506(i) 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. 316 of 2022 pending before the first respondent



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13810 of 2022

police, even though, the offences involved are not compoundable in nature.

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and as a sequel, the proceedings in Crime No. 316 of 2022 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.

01.08.2022

Internet: Yes./No

Index: Yes/no

lr

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Subramaniapuram Police Station,
Madurai City.

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13810 of 2022

V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

lr

ORDER IN
CRL.O.P (MD) No.13810 of 2022

01.08.2022