



CRL OP(MD). No.22198 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 04.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

CRL OP(MD). No.22198 of 2025

1.Edison

2.Francis Cherlin

3.Amalraj

4.Selvarani

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. State of Tamilnadu Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Puliangudi Police Station,
Tenkasi District.
Crime No.593/2025.

2.Iruthaiyaraj

... Respondents

PRAYER :- This Petition is filed under Section 528 BNSS, to call for the records in Crime No.593 of 2025, dated 10.11.2025 on the file of the first respondent and quash the same.



CRL OP(MD), No.22198 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Rajiv Rufus
For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for R1
: Mr.Kandha Vadivelan for R2

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed seeking to quash the first Information Report in Crime No.593 of 2025, on the file of the first respondent Police, which was registered for the offences under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023.

2. The gist of the allegations is that on 07.11.2025, a wordy quarrel arose between the second respondent and his wife. At that time, the second respondent's wife made a phone call to her family members, who are the petitioners herein. Thereafter, the petitioners came to the occurrence place, abused the defacto complainant in filthy language, assaulted him and caused grievous injuries. Hence, the present complaint.

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the second respondent are relatives and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 20.11.2025 has been filed before this Court.



WEB COPY

4. The petitioners and the second respondent / defacto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by the Inspector of Police, Puliangudi Police Station, Tenkasi District. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that he does not wish to pursue the FIR against the petitioners. This Court is satisfied that the compromise is voluntary and not the result of any coercion or undue influence.

5. The law relating to quashment of criminal proceedings on the basis of compromise between the parties is well settled. In ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab***¹, the Hon'ble Supreme Court authoritatively held that the inherent power of the High Court under Section 482 CrPC is of wide amplitude and may be exercised to quash criminal proceedings even in respect of non-compoundable offences, provided the dispute is essentially private in nature and the quashment would secure the ends of justice. The Court, however, drew a clear distinction between offences arising out of personal or matrimonial disputes, commercial transactions and similar private wrongs, and serious or heinous offences having grave

¹ 2012 10 SCC 303



impact on society, holding that the latter category cannot ordinarily be quashed merely on the basis of a settlement.

6. The said principles were succinctly crystallised in ***Parbatbhai Aahir v. State of Gujarat***², wherein the Supreme Court, after surveying the earlier precedents, laid down broad propositions governing the exercise of inherent jurisdiction on the basis of compromise. It was emphasised that the paramount consideration is whether the continuance of the criminal proceedings would be unfair or contrary to the interests of justice, and whether the dispute predominantly bears a civil or private character, rendering the possibility of conviction remote and bleak.

7. In ***State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan***³, the Supreme Court reiterated and clarified the limitations on such power, holding that offences of a serious nature, particularly those involving mental depravity, grave violence, or offences against society at large, cannot be quashed on the basis of compromise, even if the parties have amicably settled the dispute. The Court further cautioned that while

² (2017) 9 SCC 641

³ (2019) 5 SCC 688



CRL OP(MD), No.22198 of 2025

examining compromise quash petitions, the High Court must consider the nature and gravity of the offence, the conduct of the accused, and the stage of the proceedings, and the overall impact on society and must satisfy itself that the settlement is voluntary and not the result of coercion or undue influence.

8. Applying the aforesaid principles to the facts of the present case, this Court has carefully examined the nature and gravity of the allegations, the relationship between the parties, the conduct of the petitioner, the stage of the proceedings, and the voluntary nature of the compromise.

9. The dispute in question is predominantly private in character and does not involve any offence having serious or grave impact on society at large. In view of the compromise arrived at between the parties, the possibility of conviction is rendered remote and bleak. Continuation of the criminal proceedings would therefore serve no useful purpose and would amount to an abuse of the process of Court.



CRL OP(MD). No.22198 of 2025

10. Accordingly, the impugned FIR in Crime No.593 of 2025, on the file of the first respondent Police is hereby quashed in entirety and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The joint compromise memo dated 20.11.2025 shall form part and parcel of this order.

04.12.2025

Index: Yes/ No
Internet: Yes / No
vsg



CRL OP(MD). No.22198 of 2025

WEB COPY

TO

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



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.22198 of 2025

L.VICTORIA GOWRI,J

vsg

CRL OP(MD) No.22198 of 2025

04.12.2025