



*CrI.O.P.(MD) No.14503 of 2022*

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED:12.08.2022

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM**

CrI.O.P.(MD) No.14503 of 2022

1. Arul Stalin,
2. Prakash,
3. Pradeep Kumar @ Pradeep,

: Petitioners

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu  
Represented by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Kulsekharam Police Station,  
Kanyakumari District  
(Crime No. 264 of 2012).

2. Shiju,

: Respondents

**PRAYER:** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying to call for records pertaining to the Charge Sheet in C.C.No. 1197 of 2018, on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram, Kanniyakumari and quash the same.



WEB COPY



*Crl.O.P.(MD) No.14503 of 2022*

For Petitioners : M/s.Appaji.C.K.M.,  
For R1 : Mr.A.Albert James,  
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)  
For R2 :Mr.R.Mohanasundaram

### **ORDER**

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the Charge Sheet in C.C.No. 1197 of 2018, on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram, Kanniyakumari, for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 324, 323 IPC in Crime No.264 of 2012.

2.The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, the petitioners abused the second respondent with filthy language, assaulted him with vettukathi and caused injuries to him. Hence the complaint.

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



*Crl.O.P.(MD) No.14503 of 2022*

WEB COPY

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 Mrs.B.Bauhynasuki, WHC of Police, Kulasakharam 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 341, 294(b), 324, 323 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**



*Crl.O.P.(MD) No.14503 of 2022*

**of Gujrath)** reported in **(2017)9 SCC 641** were taken into consideration.

WEB COPY

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 C.C.No. 1197 of 2018, on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram, Kanniyakumari 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 C.C.No. 1197 of 2018, on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Padmanabhapuram, Kanniyakumari is quashed and the terms of joint compromise memo shall form part and parcel of this order.

**12.08.2022**

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



*Crl.O.P.(MD) No.14503 of 2022*

To  
WEB COPY

- 1.The Inspector of Police,  
Kulsekharam Police Station,  
Kanyakumari District
  
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai



WEB COPY



*CrI.O.P.(MD) No.14503 of 2022*

**V.SIVAGNANAM, J.**

lr

CrI.O.P.(MD) No.14503 of 2022

**12.08.2022**