



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: **21.12.2023**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **G.ILANGO VAN**

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.18954 of 2023

Ramkumar

... Petitioner/Accused No.1

Vs.

1.The State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Pappanadur Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
(In Crime No.14 of 2017).

...1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Rajappa

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto
Complainant

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, to call for the records relating to the FIR in Crime No.14 of 2017 on the file of the 1st Respondent Police and quash the same against the petitioner's concern.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Eswar

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

For R2 : Mr.C.Susikumar

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking to quash the impugned FIR in Crime No.14 of 2017 on the file of the 1st respondent police.



2.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that History Sheet was opened against the petitioner in the year 2009.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that now, he is employed in Coimbatore. For the past 7 years, no case has been registered against him.

4.But, from the perusal of the case list submitted by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), even 2020 also a case has been registered against the petitioner for the petty offence.

5. However, 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.14 of 2017 for the offences punishable under Section 386 of IPC, against the petitioner.

6.The further contention of the petitioner is that he 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.



7.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.

8.Considering the totality of the circumstances, the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner and also in view of the joint compromise memo, dated 02.11.2023, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose will be served by keeping the matter pending. Hence, all further proceedings in Crime No.14 of 2017 pending on the file of the 1st respondent police is quashed and the compromise memo is recorded.

9.In the result, the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and the entire proceedings in Crime No.14 of 2017, pending on the file of the 1st respondent police is hereby quashed in respect of the petitioner and the terms of joint compromise memo shall form part of this order.

21.12.2023

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

dss



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.18954 of 2023

G.ILANGOVAN. J.

dss

To

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

CrI.O.P.(MD) No.18954 of 2023

21.12.2023