



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 27.06.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8342 of 2025

1.Ajith @ Ajithkumar

2.Kaleeshwaran

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu rep. by its,

The Inspector of Police,

M.Reddiapatti Police Station,

Virudhunagar District.

(In Crime No.44 of 2024)

2.Vadivelmurugan

... Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023,to call for the records pertaining to Crime No.44 of 2024, dated 30.04.2024 on the file of the M.Reddiapatti Police Station, Virudhunagar District and quash the same.



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8342 of



For Petitioners : Mr.J.Mohamed Ibrahim

For Respondents : Mr.P.Kottai Chamy, (for R1)
Government Advocate(Crl.side)
Mr.K.Yasar Aratath (for R2)

ORDER

The petitioners are accused in Crime No.44 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent Police which was registered for the offence under Sections 294(b), 427 and 506(ii) of IPC. They have filed this application to quash the proceedings pending against them in Crime No.44 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent Police, on the ground that the issue has been amicably settled among themselves.

2.The case has been registered for the offence under Sections 294(b), 427 and 506(ii) of IPC of which, the offence under Section 294(b) of IPC is not compoundable. However, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in *Parbathbhai Aahir @ Parbathbhai Vs. State of Gujrath* [2017 9 SCC 641] and in *The State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Dhruv Gurjar and Another* [(2019) 2 MLJ Crl 10], has given sufficient guidelines that must be taken into consideration by the 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



WEB COPY

Court must necessarily examine whether the crime in question is purely individual in nature or a crime against the society with overriding public interest. It has been repeatedly cautioned that offences against the society with overriding public interest even if it gets settled between the parties, cannot be quashed by this Court.

3. Here, the prosecution case is that in the defacto complainant's village, one Karthik Kumar and Saranya loved each other and married without consent of their parents. Due to which, the bride's family scolded the first accused. In connection with this incident, on 30.04.2024, at about 12.10 p.m, the petitioners 1 and 2 abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and also threatened him and others with deadly weapons and fled from the scene. Hence, the present complaint.

4. Since the conflict is between the private individuals and not affecting the Society at large, this Court entertained this petition, ordered notice and also directed the investigation officer to ascertain as to whether the compromise arrived between the parties is a voluntary one, without any threat or coercion.




WEB COPY

5. The petitioners and the defacto complainant are present before this Court today and submitted that on the intervention of the elders, they have amicably resolved their issue. To that effect, they have also filed a joint compromise memo dated 02.06.2025.

6. The investigation officer, after verification, has filed a report that the compromise arrived upon between the parties is genuine, without any threat or coercion.

7. This Court has verified the parties with their Aadhar Cards and also verified as to the present status. The parties have expressed their willingness to solve the issue.

8. In the case on hand, the offences are purely individual / personal in nature and the conflict is between the private individuals and it is not affecting the Society at large. It involves the petitioners and the second respondent / defacto complainant. Quashing the case will not affect any overriding public interest. The defacto complainant himself has submitted that he does not want to prosecute the case any further. Under such circumstances, no useful purpose will be served in keeping the case




pending, even though some of the offences involved are not compoundable in nature. On the other hand, keeping the proceedings pending will only swell the mental agony of the parties.

9. In view of the above position and following the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases referred supra, this Court is inclined to quash the proceedings, though certain offences are non-compoundable, in order to avoid further conflict between the parties.

10. Accordingly, this original petition is allowed and the proceedings in Crime No.44 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent Police, is hereby quashed. The joint compromise memo dated 02.06.2025, signed by the parties, shall form part and parcel of this order.

27.06.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Internet:Yes
vsg



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8342 of



To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
M.Reddiapatti Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8342 of



B.PUGALENDHI,J

vsg

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8342 of 2025

27.06.2025