



Crl.O.P.(MD).No.19948 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED:04.12.2023

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.ILANGO VAN

Crl.O.P.(MD).No.19948 of 2022

- 1.Srinivasan
- 2.Rajaraman
- 3.Rengarajan
- 4.Muthuvijayan
- 5.Thangam
- 6.Vignesh
- 7.Malaimuthu
- 8.Sonai @ Muthukrishnan
- 9.Suresh
- 10.Muthuvijayan
- 11.Ramar @ Ramar Muthu
- 12.Thangamuthu
- 13.Karmegam
- 14.Malairamu
- 15.Ramar Muniyandi
- 16.Palraj
- 17.Chinnasamy
- 18.Palraj

... Petitioners

Vs.

- 1.The State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
A.Mukkulam Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(FIR No. 57/2018)

- 2.Sasikumar

...Respondents



Crl.O.P.(MD).No.19948 of 2022

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records of the FIR No.57/2018 dt 19.7.2018 on the file of the R1 A.Mukkulam Police Station Virudhunagar District and quash the same on the basis of compromise entered between the petitioners and the R2.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Murugappan

For R1 : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate
(Crl.side)

For R2 : Mrs.R.Nithya

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking to quash the impugned FIR in Crime No.57 of 2018 on the file of the 1st respondent police.

2.The contention of the petitioner is that based on the complaint lodged by the 2nd respondent, the 1st respondent registered the First Information Report in Crime No.57 of 2018 for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 506(ii) of IPC and Section 3 of TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992.



Crl.O.P.(MD).No.19948 of 2022

3.The further contention of the petitioner is that they compromised the issue with the 2nd respondent amicably. A joint memo of compromise was filed, which has been duly signed by the petitioner and the 2nd respondent and also by their respective counsels.

4.The petitioner and the 2nd respondent appeared before this Court along with their counsels and also produced their Aadhar cards. They were also identified by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) and the Investigation Officer. Both the parties were enquired by me and they accepted the terms of compromise. Hence, the Compromise Memo is recorded.

5.Considering the totality of the circumstances, the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner and also in view of the joint compromise memo, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose will be served by keeping the matter pending and inclined to quash all further proceedings in Crime No.57 of 2018 pending on the file of the 1st respondent police in respect of this petitioner.



Crl.O.P.(MD).No.19948 of 2022

6.In the result, the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and the entire proceedings in Crime No.57 of 2018, pending on the file of the 1st respondent police is hereby quashed in respect of the petitioner. The compromise memo is recorded and the terms of joint compromise memo shall form part of this order.

04.12.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
TM

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
A.Mukkulam Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(FIR No. 57/2018)
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD).No.19948 of 2022

G.ILANGO VAN,J.

TM

Crl.O.P.(MD).No.19948 of 2022

04.12.2023