



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11672 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.11672 of 2025

1. Jayapandi
2. Aandichi

... Petitioners

Vs

1.State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by Inspector of Police,
Aviyur Police Station, Aviyur,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.254 of 2018).

2.Sundarraaj

...Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned Final Report in C.C.No.80 of 2024 on the file of Learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Kariapatti and quash the same.

For Petitioners	: Mr.V.Sasi Kumar
For R1	: Mr.A.S.Abul Kalaam Azad, Government Advocate(Crl.side)
For R2	: Mr.S.Sankar



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11672 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioners are accused in CC No.80 of 2024, on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Kariapatti, for the offence under Sections 294(b), 506(ii) and 325 IPC. They have moved this petition to quash the above proceedings pending against them, on the ground that the issue has been amicably settled with the defacto complainant.

2. The case has been registered for the offence 191(2), 294(b), 506(ii) and 325 IPC, of which, the offence under Sections 191(2), 294(b) 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11672 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 there was a dispute over the usage of water from the common Well for irrigation by the petitioners and the defacto complainant. On 26.12.2018, when the defacto complainant and his wife were leaving their agricultural land, the petitioners have abused them in filthy language and when the same was questioned by them, the petitioner have also attacked the defacto complainant with wooden log, due to which, the defacto complainant sustained injuries. 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11672 of 2025

WEB COPY

to whether the compromise arrived between the parties is a voluntary one, without any threat or coercion.

5. The petitioners 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 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 Aadhar Cards and also verified as to the present status. The parties have expressed their willingness to solve the issue.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11672 of 2025

WEB COPY

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. 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.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11672 of 2025

WEB COPY

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the proceedings in C.C.No.80 of 2024, on the file of District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Court, Kariapatti is hereby quashed. The joint compromise memo 09.07.2025, 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,
Aviyur Police Station, Aviyur,
Virudhunagar District.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11672 of 2025

B.PUGALENDHI,J

vrn

Order made in
Crl.OP(MD)No.11672 of 2025

21.07.2025