



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15-07-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

CRL OP No. 5490 of 2026

and

CrI.M.P.No. 4145 of 2026

C.K.Manikandan
S/o.Kanniyappan,
No.74, Azhagesan nagar,
Vayalur, Kancheepuram,
Tamilnadu-603 102.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State of Tamilnadu rep.by,
The Inspector of Police,
Sadras Police Station, Kancheepuram.
(Cr.No.771/2020.)

2. Manikandan
S/o.Manickam,
No.3/194, Mariyamman Kovil street,
Poonthandalam, Vengabakkam,
Kancheepuram, Tamilnadu-603102.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 582 of BNSS Act, 2023, to call for the records relating to the criminal proceedings in PRC No.20 of 2022 on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thirukazhukundram and quash the same and pass such further or other orders as this Honble court.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Mukesh Kannah

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Rajasekaran
Government Counsel (CrI. Side) for R1



ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition seeks to quash PRC.No.20 of 2022 on the file of the learned District cum Judicial Magistrate, Thirukazhukundram for alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 506(ii), 307 & 149 of IPC, on the ground of compromise between the parties. The parties are present before the court and, on examination, stand by their compromise and do not want the case to proceed further.

2. The broad contours of the High Court's power to exercise extraordinary jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.p.c. and Section 528 of the BNSS in respect of compromise of non-compoundable offences are laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Gian Singh -Vs- State of Punjab and Another* (2012 10 SCC 303) and other subsequent judgments.

3. The gist of facts leading to the instant case is that all the Accused, A1 to A7 were armed with deadly weapons such as knife, aruva, iron pipes and it is the specific allegation as against the petitioner that the petitioner attacked the de facto complainant with Aruva on the neck. However, when the records relating to the final report is seen, there is no AR copy, there is no injury on the de facto complainant and there is no examination of the Doctor. The de facto complainant submits that wordy quarrel arose with reference to drawing of a picture in the wall. Considering the same, even though the offence is included



as 307, it can be seen that the case can be treated as private in nature for the purpose of exercise of power under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

4. Thus, it can be seen that this matter is a fit case for the exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction to quash the case on compromise.

5. Accordingly, this Crl.O.P. No.5490 of 2026 stands allowed. The proceedings in PRC.No.20 of 202 on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thirukazhukundram stands quashed as against the petitioner alone. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

15-07-2026

Neutral Citation: No

KKN



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

KKN

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Sadras Police Station,
Kancheepuram.
- 2.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Thirukazhukundram.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.

CRL OP No. 5490 of 2026

15-07-2026