



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.20855 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.02.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.ILANGO VAN

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.20855 of 2022

1. Sathiyaraj,
2. Chinnaappanasamy,
3. Ramamoorthi,
4. Karupaiyasamy,
5. Saminathan,
6. Rajasekar,
7. Rajaguru,
8. Muniaraj,
9. Karthikairaj @ Karthigai Selvam
10. Vijayan,
11. Panneerselvam,

: Petitioners

Vs

1. The State represented by
The Sub Inspector of Police,
M.Reddiapatti Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
Crime No.102 of 2022

2. Kalidass,

: Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying this Court to call for the records in the case in Crime No.102 of 2022 on the



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.20855 of 2022

file of the first respondent police and quash the same as illegal, violation of law.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Jothi Basu
For R1 : Mr.M.Muthumanikkam
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
For R2 : Mrs.D.Thilaga Rani

ORDER

This criminal original petition has been filed seeking to quash the FIR in Crime No.102 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 attacked the defacto complainant with stick, abused him with filthy language and threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the complaint.

3. When the matter is taken up for hearing today, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the second respondent has lodged a complaint before the first respondent and on that basis, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.102 of 2022 dated 07.11.2022 for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323 and 506(1) IPC against the petitioners.



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.20855 of 2022

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 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.K.Ramamoorthy, SSI, M.Reddiapatti 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.

6. In the instant case, it is a family dispute and now the parties had compromised. Where the parties have compromised the matter, the High Court has power to quash the complaint for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323 and 506(1) IPC.



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.20855 of 2022

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.102 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.102 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.

21.02.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
lr



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.20855 of 2022

To

WEB COPY

1. The Sub Inspector of Police,
M.Reddiapatti Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.20855 of 2022

G.ILANGO VAN, J.

lr

ORDER IN
Crl.O.P.(MD) No.20855 of 2022

21.02.2023