

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11427 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
WEB COPY

DATED : 21.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

Crl.OP(MD)No.11427 of 2025

M.Mahendran

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Thallakulam Police Station,
Madurai City.
(Crime No. 249/2020)

2.Vijayalakshmi

...Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records relating to the charge sheet in C.C.No.1944 of 2024 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Madurai and quash the same as against the petitioner.

For Petitioner

: Mr.M.Subash Babu

For R1

: Mr.A.S.Abul Kalaam Azad,
Government Advocate(Crl.side)

For R2

: Mr.M.Chandra Bose




Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11427 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner is the sole accused in C.C.No.1944 of 2024, on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Madurai, for the offence under Sections 294(b), 323, 354 and 506(ii) IPC. He has moved this petition to quash the above proceedings pending against him, on the ground that the issue has been amicably settled with the defacto complainant.

2. The case has been registered for the offence 294(b), 323, 354 and 506(ii) IPC, of which, the offence under Sections 294(b), 354 IPC are 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 Court must necessarily examine whether the crime in question is purely individual in nature or a crime against the society with overriding



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11427 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 the defacto complainant is working as a Revenue Tahsildar at Madurai. The defacto complainant and the petitioner are living as wife and husband. By taking advantage of her official position, the petitioner has abused her and also compelled her to alter revenue records and also to issue bogus certificates. When the defacto complainant refused to do so, the petitioner abused her in filthy language and also assaulted her. Based on the complaint of the second respondent /the defacto complainant, the above case has been registered as against the petitioners.

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.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11427 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. The petitioner and the defacto complainant are present before this Court today and submit that on the intervention of the elders of the Village, they have amicably settled the issue and therefore, the defacto complainant is not inclined to prosecute the case further. To that effect, they have also filed a joint compromise memo, dated 24.06.2025.

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11427 of 2025

WEB COPY

and the second respondent / defacto complainant. Quashing the case will not affect any overriding public interest. There is a case and counter case. The defacto complainant 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 Criminal Original Petition is allowed, with a direction to the defacto complainant for having set the law in motion, made the police officers to conduct an investigation and file the final report, to pay a sum of Rs.25,000/- to the credit of the respondent



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11427 of 2025

WEB COPY

police station and the amount to be deposited by the defacto complainant shall be utilized for the welfare activities of the concerned police station. The proceedings in C.C.No.1944 of 2024, on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Madurai is hereby quashed. The joint compromise memo 24.06.2025, signed by the parties, shall form part and parcel of this order.

21.07.2025

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

vrn

To

The Inspector of Police,
Thallakulam Police Station,
Madurai City.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11427 of 2025

B.PUGALENDHI,J

vrn

Order made in
Crl.OP(MD)No.11427 of 2025

21.07.2025