



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 19.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

Crl.O.P(MD)No.22381 of 2025

Selva @ Selvam

... Petitioner/Accused No.2

Vs.

1. State of Tamilnadu
Rep by Inspector of Police,
Bazaar Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
(Crime No. 80 of 2019)

...Respondent No.1/De-jure complainant

2. Ranjithkumar

...Respondent No.2/Defacto complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., to call for the records connected with the case in C.C. No. 740 of 2025 pending on the file of the Learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram and quash the same.

For Petitioner : M/s.S.Malaikani

For Respondents : Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh
Government Advocate(crl.side)
for R1



ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR in Cr.No.80 of 2019 on the file of the first respondent police.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 19.05.2019 at about 8.00 p.m., some of the persons were creating unwanted noise at E.C.R. road and when the same was questioned, a quarrel erupted between the petitioner and the accused person, following which the accused have attacked the defacto complainant.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the second respondent has lodged a complaint before the first respondent police and on that basis, FIR came to be registered in Cr.No.80 of 2019 for the offenses under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC and the case is still under investigation. By passage of time, the parties have decided to bury the hatchet and compromise the dispute amicably among themselves.

4. A joint compromise memo has been filed before this Court which has been signed by the petitioner and the second respondent and also by the respective Counsels. The petitioner and the second respondent were also present in person before this Court and identified by Mr.Selva, SSI of Police, Bazaar Police Station, Ramanathapuram District as well as by the learned



counsel appearing for the parties. The Court also enquired both the parties and was satisfied that the parties have come to an amicable settlement between themselves.

5. In the instant case, the petitioner is the 2nd accused. Now the parties have compromised the matter amicably. The High Court has power to quash the complaint even if the offences are non-compoundable in nature, considering the facts and circumstances of the case.

6. The legal position expressed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another** reported in **(2012) 10 SCC 303** and **Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Vs. State of Gujarat** reported in **(2017) 9 SCC 641** were taken into consideration.

7. In the light of the guidelines issued in the above said Judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose will be served in keeping the proceedings in Cr.No.80 of 2019 pending before the first respondent police, even though the offences involved are not compoundable in nature.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and as a sequel, the proceedings in Cr.No.80 of 2019 on the file of the first respondent police is quashed as against the petitioner and the terms of joint compromise memo shall form part and parcel of this order.



WEB COPY

9. The petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.5,000/-(Rupees Five Thousand only) as non-refundable deposit for the said vehicle to the credit of the Adyar Cancer Institute (Union Bank, Name: Cancer Institute (WIA), Account No: 149710011005477, IFSC Code: UBIN0814971), Chennai.

10. Post the matter on **08.01.2026, “for reporting compliance”**.

19.12.2025
1/2

RJR

To

1. The learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram
2. The Inspector of Police,
Bazaar Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

RJR

Cr1.O.P(MD)No.22381 of 2025

19.12.2025
1/2