



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22109 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 05.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22109 of 2025

1.Soosai @ Mariasoosai

2.James

3.Arul Jesu

4.Lawrence Nathan

... Petitioners/A1 to A4

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Sub-Inspector of Police,
Kallal Police Station,
Kallal, Sivagangai District.
(Crime No.241 of 2025)

... 1st respondent /
Complainant

2.Arul Jesu

... 2nd respondent / de-facto
Complainant

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned FIR in Crime No.241 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police dated 02.11.2025 and quash the same.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22109 of 2025

For Petitioners : Mr.C.Jeya Prakash
For R1 : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)
For R2 : Mr.P.Karthik

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.241 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police, insofar as the petitioners are concerned.

2. On 02.11.2025, at about 7.30 a.m., due to previous enmity between the de-facto complainant and the petitioners on account of a dispute relating to the commemoration of ancestors in graveyard, the petitioners attacked the de-facto complainant and also abused him using filthy language. Consequently, a complaint was lodged against the petitioner in Crime No.241 of 2025 before the 1st respondent police for the alleged offences under Sections 296(b), 127(2), 118(1), and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the 2nd respondent are residing in the same locality and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 26.11.2025 has been filed before this Court.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22109 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. The petitioners and the 2nd respondent/de-facto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.S.P.Jeyashankar, Sub Inspector of Police, Kallal Police Station, Kallal, Sivagangai District. The de-facto 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 Cr.P.C 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 impact on society, holding that the latter category cannot ordinarily be quashed merely on the basis of a settlement.

¹ 2012 10 SCC 303



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 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.

² 2017 9 SCC 641

³ 2019 5 SCC 688



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22109 of 2025

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 petitioners, 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.

10. Accordingly, the impugned First Information Report in Crime No.241 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police, is quashed insofar the petitioners are concerned, and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The joint compromise memo dated 26.11.2025 shall form part and parcel of this order.

05.12.2025
(2/3)

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22109 of 2025

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

mkn

To

1.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Kallal Police Station,
Kallal, Sivagangai District.

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22109 of 2025

**05.12.2025
(2/3)**