



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16186 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 24.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.O.P.(MD).No.16186 of 2025

1. Suruli

2. Kavibalan

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 11

Vs.

1. State Represented By,
The Inspector of Police,
Nainarkoil Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
(Crime No.119/2018).

...1st Respondent / Complainant

2. Vinoth Raja

... 2nd Respondent/ Defacto
Complainant

3. Mari @ Mariyammal

... 3rd Respondent / Victim

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records relating to the Impugned Charge Sheet in S.C.No.221 of 2023 on the file of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram District and quash the same in so far as the petitioners are concerned.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Yasar Arafath

For R1 : Mr.R.Meenakshi Sundaram
Additional Public Prosecutor

For R2 and R3 : Mr.J.Mohamed Ibrahim



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16186 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioners seek to quash the final report in S.C.No.221 of 2023 on the file of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram District, which was filed for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 324, 506(ii) of IPC, Section 4 of TNPHW Act, 2002 and Section 3 of TN PPDL Act, 1992.

2. The allegation in the final report is that due to previous enmity, the petitioner abused the defacto complainant in filthy language, attacked him and the third respondent and also damaged his bike and thus, committed the aforesaid offences.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the co-accused had already filed a quash petition in Crl.O.P(MD) No.613 of 2023 and this Court had quashed the proceedings as against the co-accused based on the joint compromise memo, vide order, dated 23.01.2025; that at that time, the petitioners could not participate in the compromise; and that the parties have now entered into a compromise and decided to give a quietus to the entire dispute.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16186 of 2025

4. The parties have filed a joint compromise memo dated 24th September

2025 and the scanned copy of the compromise memo reads as follows:

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE MADRAS AT
MADURAI BENCH
(Criminal Original Jurisdiction)
Crl.O.P.(MD).No. 16186 Of 2025
In
S.C.No.221 of 2023
(On the file of the Hon'ble Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Ramanathapuram,Ramanathapuram District)**

1. Suruli,Male/ 33Years,
S/o. Archunan,
No.2/33,Kilakutheru,
K Valsai,Paramkudi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

2. Kavibalan,Male/27 Years,
S/o. Sithiraivelu,
No.2/77, Kilakutheru,
K Valsai,Paramkudi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 11

-Versus-

1. State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Nainarkoil Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
(Cr.No.119/2018).

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. Vinoth Raja,
S/o.Muniyasamy,
No.1/80,K Valsai,
Paramakudi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

3. Mari @ Mariyammal,
W/o.Ramakrishnan,
No.1/45,Middle Street,
K Valsai, Paramakudi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

...3rd Respondent/ Victim

JOINT COMPROMISE MEMO

The Petitioners and the 2nd and 3rd Respondents would jointly submit
that the above 1st Respondent / Complainant has registered the case against

A. Suruli & E. Balan
Petitioners/ Accused no.4 and 11

Vinoth Raja
10/11/25
2nd & 3rd Respondents




Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16186 of 2025


WEB COPY

the Petitioners and Other Accused Persons for an alleged punishable 147,148,294(b),324 and 506(ii) of IPC and Section 4 Of TN Prohibition Of Harassment of Women Act, 2002 and section 3 of TN Public Property(Private of Damage & Loss) Act, 1992 in Crime No.119 of 2018 dated 09.11.2018 based on the complaint given by the 2nd respondent. Subsequently the 1st respondent Police has completed the Investigation and filed Charge Sheet and taken on file in S C.No.221 of 2023 on the file of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram District.

2. The Petitioners and the 2 and 3rd Respondents would jointly submit that the case of the prosecution is that the on the date of occurrence the defacto complainant has parked his two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN65 AY 1572 in front of one Balu bunk shop and he usual talking with his friends, at that time the due to previous motive the Petitioner and other accused persons have assembled together and abused filthy language to the Defacto complainant and they have attacked to the defacto complainant and 3rd respondent and one Irail Amuthan with hand and iron rod. Subsequently the accused persons have cause damaged to the defacto complainant's two wheeler, after that they have threatened to them. Hence the case has been registered.

3. The Petitioners and the 2 and 3rd Respondents would jointly submit that the above dispute amicably settled petitioners and the 2nd & 3rd respondents. There was a wordy duel between both of them but nothing happened as alleged by the prosecution.


Petitioners/ Accused no.4 and 11


2nd & 3rd Respondents



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16186 of 2025


WEB COPY

The Petitioners submit that except the Petitioners all other accused persons have filed a Crl.O.P.(MD) No. 6159 of 2022 and Crl.O.P.(MD) No. 613 of 2025 before this hon'ble court for seeking quash of the FIR as well as charge sheet, at that time the Hon'ble court was allowed based on the their compromise memo. Now both side compromised. At present the Defacto-Complainant and victim had compromised with the petitioners. After registering the FIR they have shed all their misunderstanding and have compromised in the presence of the well-wishers and have mutually agreed to withdraw in the above case in S.C.No.221 of 2023 on the file of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram District.

4. The Petitioners and the 2nd & 3rd Respondents would jointly submit that the matter has been compromised between both of them with intervention of the mediator and well-wishers of both sides without any inducement made by others. The Defacto Complainant and victim have specifically admitted that they have no objection if the Charge Sheet in question is quashed. Further they had given an undertaking that Defacto Complainant is ready to withdraw the case and no objection to quash the Charge Sheet in S.C.No.221 of 2023 on the file of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram, Ramanathapuram District.

5. The Petitioners and the 2nd & 3rd Respondents would jointly submit that such compromise has been taken place purely with an intention to settle their dispute among them and it is purely voluntary by the parties concerned.


Petitioners/ Accused no.4 and 11



2nd & 3rd Respondents



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16186 of 2025

WEB COPY

Hence, in order to avoid further ordeal of trial before the Trial Court, they are preferred to be present before this Hon'ble Court whenever it is required. This Hon'ble Court by taking into consideration of the above said aspects with regard to the compromise and in the interest of the parties, can leniently look into the present issue, as such the prayer sought for by the Petitioners can be allowed.

The Hon'ble Apex Court of India has ruled that "the High Court in exercise of inherent power could quash the Criminal Proceedings or FIR the complaint in appropriate Court in order to meet the ends of justice"

It is therefore prayed that the Petitioners and the 2 & 3rd Respondents jointly pray that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to take into consideration of the present Joint Compromise Memo and quash the Charge Sheet in S.C.No.221 of 2023 on the file of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram, Ramanathapuram District and thus render Justice.

Dated at Madurai on this 24th day of September, 2025

Counsel for the Petitioners

Counsel for the 2nd & 3rd Respondents

Petitioners/ Accused no.4 and 11

2nd & 3rd Respondents

5. The petitioners namely, Suruli (Aadhaar No.7675 5283 5080), Kavibalan (Aadhaar No.8527 8356 9029) and the second respondent, namely, Vinothraja (Aadhaar No.3622 0994 9728) are present before this Court in person and are identified by M/s.S.Janci Reeta, Woman Special Sub Inspector



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16186 of 2025

of Police, Nainarkoil Police Station, Ramanathapuram District. The second respondent confirms the compromise and states that she has no objection for quashing the sessions case.

6. Considering the nature of the allegations and the compromise arrived between the parties and the matter was already compromised with the co-accused and the proceedings against them was quashed by this Court in Crl.O.P(MD) No.613 of 2025, vide order, dated 23.01.2024, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be served in keeping the impugned final report pending trial. Accordingly, the impugned final report in S.C.No.221 of 2023 on the file of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramanathapuram District, is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The petitioners shall pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) as costs to the High Court Legal Services Authority attached to this Bench forthwith and file a photocopy of the receipt along with a memo reporting compliance in the Registry.

24.09.2025

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

Indu



WEB COPY

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Nainarkoil Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16186 of 2025



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16186 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Indu

Crl.O.P(MD).No.16186 of 2025

24.09.2025