



Crl.O.P.No.29772 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.11.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.O.P.No.29772 of 2025

1. Manikandan
2. Sangeli Karuppan
3. S.Muthupandi

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The State,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
N1, Royapuram Police Station,
Royapuram, Chennai 600 013.

2. Rani

... Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of B.N.S.S./482 of Cr.P.C., praying to call for the records in Crime No.531 of 2025 pending before the 1st respondent Police and to quash the proceedings.

For Petitioners : Mr.P.Nagaraj

For Respondents : Mr.R.Vinothraja,
Government Advocate for R1
Mr.J.B.Solomon Peter Kamal Doss
for R2

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the F.I.R against the petitioner in Crime No.531 of 2025, for the offences under Sections 296(b), 74, 79 and 318 (2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of



Women Act, 2002 before the 1st respondent Police.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners and the de facto complainant are the family members of the proposed bride and groom respectively. Both the family members conducted the engagement on 28.05.2025 and fixed the marriage on 04.09.2025. However, due to difference of opinion between the two families, the marriage was stalled which led to lodging of a complaint against the petitioners by the de facto complainant.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the parties have entered into a compromise between themselves. The defacto complainant/second respondent has no grievance as against the petitioners and to that effect, a Memo of Compromise dated, 24.10.2025, has also been filed.

4. The petitioners and the de facto complainant were present before this Court at the time of hearing and they were identified by their respective counsel and by Mr.G.Indra Kumar, PC 56570, N1, Royapuram Police Station, Chennai.

5. This Court also enquired both the parties and was satisfied that the parties have come to an amicable settlement between themselves.



WEB COPY

6. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing on behalf of the respondent-Police 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.

7. 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 petitioner. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Parbathbhai Aahir @ Parbathbhai Vs. State of Gujrat*, 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 by this Court while exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C./528 BNSS, 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.

8. In the present case, the offences in question are purely individual/personal in nature. It involves dispute between the petitioner and the de facto complainant 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.

9. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to quash the FIR against the petitioner alone in Crime No.531 of 2025, on the file of the first respondent Police, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C./528 BNSS.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the FIR in Crime No.531 of 2025, on the file of the first respondent Police, is quashed, as against the petitioners alone, subject to condition that the petitioners shall pay costs of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Only) jointly to the credit of Tamil Nadu State Legal Services Authority, Madras



Crl.O.P.No.29772 of 2025

High Court campus, Chennai 600 104, on or before 17.11.2025.

WEB COPY

11. The Memo of Compromise, dated 24.10.2025, filed by the parties for compromising the offences, shall form part of the records.

12. Post the matter on 18.11.2025 “for reporting compliance.”

03.11.2025

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
vum

Note: Issue Order copy on 04.11.2025

To:

1. The Inspector of Police,
N1, Royapuram Police Station,
Royapuram, Chennai 600 013.
2. The Principal Sessions Judge at Chennai.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA,J.,

vum



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.29772 of 2025

Crl.O.P.Nos.29772 of 2025

03.11.2025