



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.393 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 03.02.2023

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.393 of 2023

Kathirkamaselvam

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State through the Inspector of Police,
Virudhunagar West Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
Crime No.193 of 2022.

2.Ramesh Moorthy

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records relating to the FIR in Crime No.193 of 2022, for the offences punishable under Sections 454, 457 and 380 IPC and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Malaichamy,

For R1 : Mr.M.Muthumanikkam
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For R2 : Mr.R.Rajamohan,



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.393 of 2023

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 482 Cr.P.C., seeking orders, to call for the records relating to the FIR in Crime No.193 of 2022, for the offences punishable under Sections 454, 457 and 380 IPC and quash the same.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is running call Taxi office, namely 'Best Track' and on 18.11.2022, at about 09.00 am, when he went to his office, he found that one Laptop, worth about Rs.5,000/- was missing. Hence the complaint.

3. When the matter is taken up for hearing today, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is working as a Driver under the second respondent. The second respondent has given this false complaint against the petitioner before the first respondent and on that basis, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.193 of 2022, dated 18.11.2022 for the offences under Sections 454, 457 and 380 IPC.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.393 of 2023

WEB COPY

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

5. A Joint Memo of Compromise has been filed 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 Mr.N.Krishnamoorthy, SSI, West Police Station, Virudhunagar 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.

6. Where the parties have compromised the matter, the High Court has power to quash the complaint for the offences under Sections 454, 457 and 380 IPC.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.393 of 2023

7. 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.

8. 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.193 of 2022, pending before the first respondent police, even though, the offences involved are not compoundable in nature.

9. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and as a sequel, the proceedings in Crime No.193 of 2022 on the file of the first respondent police, is quashed and the terms of joint compromise memo shall form part and parcel of this order.

03.02.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
das



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.393 of 2023

To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.393 of 2023

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

das

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.393 of 2023

Dated: 03.02.2023