



CrI.O.P.(MD) No.13901 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED:10.08.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CrI.O.P.(MD) No.13901 of 2022

1. Muthu
2. Rajeswari

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The Inspector of Police
Sivagangai Town Police Station
Sivagangai District

2. Sathya

....Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.
praying to call for the records pertaining to the FIR in Crime No.722 of
2017 dated 01.09.2017 on the file of the first respondent and quash the
same.

For Petitioners	: Mrs.Anandhavalli
For Respondents	: Mr.Sakthi Kumar
No.1	Government Advocate(CrI.Side)
No.2	: Mr.S.Shanmugam



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13901 of 2022

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR in 722 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent police

2.The case of the prosecution is that the marriage between the second respondent and the petitioner's son was solemnized on 29.04.2016 and thereafter due to some dispute, the petitioners herein hurt the defacto complainant, hence the case came to be registered.

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.C.Chellpandi, No.885, Sivagangai Town Police Station



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13901 of 2022

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 complainant is the daughter-in-law of the petitioners and they have settled out of court now the parties had compromised. Where the parties have compromised the matter, the High Court has power to quash the complaint for the offence under Sections 294(b),324,506(ii) and 498(A) 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. 722 of 2017 pending before the first



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13901 of 2022

WEB COPY

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.722 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent police respondent police, is quashed insofar as the petitioners alone and the terms of joint compromise memo shall form part and parcel of this order.

10.08.2022

Internet: Yes
Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non speaking order
aav

To

1. The Inspector of Police
Sivagangai Town Police Station
Sivagangai District
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD) No.13901 of 2022

V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

aav

CrI.O.P.(MD) No.13901 of 2022

10.08.2022