



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.30707 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.O.P.No.30707 of 2025 and
Crl.M.P.Nos.21007 and 21009 of 2025

Naveen Raju

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
W-22, All Women Police Station,
Mylapore, Chennai – 600 004.
Crime No.6/2024

2. Keerthana

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. to call for the records in C.C.No.2730 of 2024 pending on the file of the learned XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai and quash the same as against the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Muruganandam

For R1 : Mr.R.Vinothraja
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For R2 : Mr.Ganesan



Crl.O.P.No.30707 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to call for the records in C.C.No.2730 of 2024 pending on the file of the learned XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai and to quash the same on the ground of compromise.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is suffering from *Paranoid personality traits psychiatric symptoms* (a mental disability) and therefore, he is represented by his mother. Upon coming to know that the petitioner has been involved in the case, the petitioner's mother had contacted the second respondent/de facto complainant for an amicable settlement and thereby, the second respondent/de facto complainant has also agreed to pardon the petitioner and they have entered into a compromise. The petitioner's mother had paid to the de facto complainant, a compensation of Rs.5,00,000/- by demand draft (DD No.148111680) for the hardship caused by the petitioner to her.

3. Mr.Ganesan, learned counsel appearing for the de facto complainant submitted that the matter has been compromised and the defacto complainant has no objection in quashing all the charges against the



petitioner.

WEB COPY

4. The petitioner's mother and the de facto complainant/2nd respondent, were present before this Court at the time of hearing and they were identified by their respective counsel and by Ms.T.Mahalakshmi, W Gr II, WPC, AWPS, Mylapore, Chennai.

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

6. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing on behalf of the respondent-Police submitted that the petitioner's mother has enclosed the certificate issued by Ahana Hospital and Research Centre, Madurai for the treatment undergone by her son. 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.

7. The main issue that requires the consideration of this Court is as to whether this Court can quash the criminal proceedings involving non-



CrI.O.P.No.30707 of 2025

compoundable offences pending against the petitioner. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of *Parbathbhai Aahir @ Parbathbhai Vs. State of Gujarat*, reported in (2017) 9 SCC 641, 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 they get 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 proceedings against the petitioner in C.C.No.2730 of 2024, on the file of the learned XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, in exercise of its



CrI.O.P.No.30707 of 2025

jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C./528 BNSS.

WEB COPY

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the proceedings against the petitioner in C.C.No.2730 of 2024, on the file of the learned XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, is quashed. Consequently connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. The Affidavits filed by the defacto complainant and the petitioner's mother, for compromising the offences shall form part of the records.

28.11.2025

shl

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

To

1. The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate,
Saidapet
2. The Inspector of Police,
W-22, All Women Police Station,
Mylapore, Chennai – 600 004.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.30707 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA J.

shl

Crl.O.P.No.30707 of 2025 and
Crl.M.P.Nos.21007 and 21009 of 2025

28.11.2025