



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 08.01.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

CrI.O.P(MD)No.16495 of 2024

and

CrI.M.P.(MD)No.10353 of 2024

1.Veerappan

2.Karthick

3.Hari @ Hari Sivagangai

4.Minor. Chandru

... Petitioners

-Vs-

1.Tamil Nadu the State,
Rep its Inspector of Police,
Manikandam Police Station,
Trichy District.
(In Crime No.100 of 2024)

2.Dhanapal

... Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition - filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Shuraksha Sanhita, to call for the records relating to the case in Crime No.100 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioners	: Mr.S.Alagusundar
For R1	: Mr.K.Sanjai Gandhi
	Government Advocate (CrI.Side)
For R2	: Mr.R.Paranjothi



ORDER


WEB COPY

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.100 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent Police.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner had borrowed a sum of Rs.300/- from the mother of the defacto complainant. When the same was asked to be returned, the petitioners are said to have attacked the defacto complainant and his parents with deadly weapons.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the second respondent has lodged a complaint before the first respondent Police and on that basis, F.I.R. came to be registered in Crime No.100 of 2024 for the offences under Sections 341, 294(b), 323, 324 and 506 (ii) IPC.

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.



WEB COPY

5. A Joint Memo of Compromise has been filed before this Court, which has 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.A.Sagayaseelan, SSI of Police, Manikandam Police Station, Trichy District as well as by the learned counsel 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, there is a money dispute between the petitioners and the defacto complainant's family. Now the parties compromised the matter amicably. The High Court has power to quash the complaint even if the offences are non compoundable in nature, considering the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. The legal position expressed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another*** reported in ***(2012)10 SCC 303*** and ***Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Vs. State of Gujarat*** 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.100 of 2024, 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.100 of 2024, 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. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed

08.01.2025

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

ta

To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16495 of 2024

M.NIRMAL KUMAR,J.

ta

Crl.O.P(MD)No.16495 of 2024

08.01.2025