



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.30150 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.10.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR

CrI.O.P.No.30150 of 2022

and

CrI.M.P.No.18483 of 2022

1. Ravichandran
2. Elanzheiyan
3. Indhumathi
4. Ranjith Kumar

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Virudhachalam Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
2. Kalaiselvi

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C/528 BNSS, to call for the records in connection with the final report in P.R.C.No.32 of 2020 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhachalam and quash the same.



Crl.O.P.No.30150 of 2022

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Saravana Kumar
For R1 : Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the final report filed in connection with Crime No.87 of 2019 registered on the file of the first respondent, on the basis of the compromise arrived at between the petitioners and the de facto complainant/second respondent.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the de facto complainant/second respondent, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first respondent and perused the materials available on record.

3. The crux of the allegations in the First Information Report is that due to a pathway dispute, on 01.03.2019, the petitioners/accused, who are the relatives of the de facto complainant, went to the house of the de facto complainant, abused her in filthy language, assaulted her and also threatened with dire consequences. Hence, the complaint was given and the First Information Report was registered in Crime No.87 of 2019 for the



CrI.O.P.No.30150 of 2022

offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 307, 324, 427, 506(ii) of IPC
r/w Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act.

After completion of investigation, the case was taken up on file by the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Virudhachalam, in P.R.C.No.32 of 2020 and the same was committed to the Court of Sessions in S.C.No.57 of 2024 on the file of the Mahila Court, Cuddalore and now the same is sought to be quashed.

4. Now, the learned counsels appearing for the petitioners submitted that the parties have settled the dispute between them amicably and hence, seek to quash the proceedings pending against the petitioners. He also produced the Joint Memo of Compromise executed by the petitioners and the second respondent to that effect.

5. The petitioners and the de-facto complainant/R2 appeared before this Court and were identified by Mr.C.Venu, SSI, Virudhachalam Police Station, Cuddalore District.



Crl.O.P.No.30150 of 2022

6. On being enquired by this Court, the de facto complainant stated that she has amicably settled the dispute with the petitioners and she is not willing to pursue the criminal proceedings against them and therefore, seeks to quash the same.

7. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the first respondent submitted that now the case has been committed to the court of sessions in S.C.No.57 of 2024. He further submitted that though the parties entered into a compromise while this case is pending, this Court, taking into account the seriousness of the offence has to consider the issue as to whether an offence of this nature can be quashed on the ground of compromise between parties.

8. The main issue that requires the consideration of this Court is as to whether this Court can quash the criminal proceedings involving non-compoundable offences pending against the petitioners. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Parbathbhai Aahir @ Parbathbhai Vs. State of Gujarat*, reported in *2017 9 SCC 641* and in case of *The State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Dhruv Gurjar and Another* reported in *(2019) 2 MLJ Crl 10*, has given sufficient guidelines that must be taken into consideration



Crl.O.P.No.30150 of 2022

by this Court while exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C,

to quash non-compoundable offences. One very important test that has been laid down is that the Court must necessarily examine if the crime in question is purely individual in nature or a crime against the society with overriding public interest. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that offences against the society with overriding public interest even if it gets settled between the parties, cannot be quashed by this Court.

9. In the present case, the offences in question are purely individual/personal in nature and the injuries sustained by the victim are simple in nature. It involves dispute between the petitioners and the second respondent and quashing the proceedings will not affect any overriding public interest in this case and no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the criminal proceedings. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to quash the proceedings pending against the petitioners in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.



CrI.O.P.No.30150 of 2022

WEB COPY

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed. The proceedings in S.C.No.57 of 2024, pending on the file of the Mahila Court, Cuddalore District, is quashed as against the petitioners. The Joint Memo of Compromise filed by the petitioners and the second respondent for compromising the offences shall form part of the record. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

15.10.2025

ham

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

To

1. The Mahila Court, Cuddalore District.
2. The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Virudhachalam.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Virudhachalam Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.30150 of 2022

N. SATHISH KUMAR, J.

ham

***Crl.O.P.No.30150 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.No.18483 of 2022***

15.10.2025