

CrIOP(MD)No.10870 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 11.07.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

CrIOP(MD)No.10870 of 2025

Sanjay Selvam @ Sakthiselvam

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Manur Police Station,
Tiruneleli District .
[Crime No.456 of 2025]

2.M.Manohar Kumar

... Respondents

The Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 BNSS, to call for the records relating to call for the records impugned FIR in Crime No.456 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police and quash the same as against the petitioners.

For Petitioner	: Mr.M.Jegadeesha Pandian
For R1	: Mr.P.Kottaichamy Government Advocate(Crl.side)
For R2	: Mr.T.Eswar



CrIOP(MD)No.10870 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioner is an accused in Crime No.456 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police registered for the offence under Sections 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) BNS. He has filed this application to quash the proceedings pending against him, on the ground that the issue has been amicably settled among themselves.

2.The case has been registered for the offence under Section 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) BNS of which, the offence under Section 296(b) and 118(1) of BNS are non 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 CrI 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, [now 528 of BNSS] to quash non-compoundable offences. One very important test that has been laid down is that the 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

WEB by this Court.

3. Here the case of the prosecution is that the 2nd respondent / defacto complainant while was walking on a road along with his friends, the petitioner drove his car in a dangerous way and the defacto complainant and his friends got a narrow escape. When it was questioned by them, the petitioner left the place with lethargic reply. Subsequently after two days, when the defacto complainant was standing along with his friends, the petitioner came, abused and attacked the defacto complainant. Hence the 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.

5. The petitioner 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 09.07.2025.

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 Aadhaar 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 petitioner and the 2nd respondent / defacto complainant and their respective families only. Quashing the case will not affect any overriding public interest. The defacto complainant herself has submitted that she 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 certain offences involved are non compoundable in nature. On the other hand, keeping the proceedings pending will only swell the mental agony of the parties.



CrIOP(MD)No.10870 of 2025

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.456 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent is hereby quashed. The joint compromise memo dated 09.07.2025 signed by the parties, shall form part and parcel of this order.

11.07.2025

DSK

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Manur Police Station,
Tiruneleli District .

2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CrIOP(MD)No.10870 of 2025

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

DSK

CrIOP(MD)No.10870 of 2025

11.07.2025