



Crl.O.P.No.3837 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17.02.2026

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.O.P.No.3837 of 2026
and Crl.MP No.2655 of 2026

1. Sankar
2. Prasanth
3. Divakar
4. Ramasamy
5. Jayachandran
6. G.Ganesan
7. Anbu
8. Singaram
9. Mari @ Perumal
10. Dharuman
11. Vinoth
12. Tamil Selvi
13. Sakthi
14. Sandhiya @ Sathiya
15. Sehebagavalli @ senbagavalli
16. Sangeetha
17. Amirtham
18. Saradha
19. Rani @ Selvarani

... Petitioners



Crl.O.P.No.3837 of 2026

Vs.

1.The State represented by
The Inspector Police,
Jolarpet Police Station,
Vellore District.
(Now Tirupattur District)
Crime No.426 of 2020

2. Sumathi

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita/Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the entire records pursuant to the FIR in Crime No.426 of 2020 on the file of the 1st respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Sathish Kumar

For R1 : Mr.S.Santhosh
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For R2 : Mr.S.Gokul

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to call for the records relating to Crime No.426 of 2020, on the file of the first respondent and to quash the same.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the *de facto* complainant's son Thirupathi and the 1st petitioner's daughter, Priyadarshini were having love affair, and they eloped from the house on



Crl.O.P.No.3837 of 2026

13.06.2020, and they got married on 14.06.2020 at Kakangari Mariamman Temple, Tirupathur Taluk. He would submit that the 1st petitioner who was agitated over the same, had gone to the house of the *de facto* complainant, and during such time, there was a quarrel which resulted in the incident. He would further submit that due to the intervention of well-wishers and elders, both the parties have now agreed to compromise the matter.

3.Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the first respondent and the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent.

4.Based on the complaint given by the *de facto* complainant/R2, the case in Crime No.426 of 2020, was registered for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 448, 294(b), 506(ii), 307 of IPC r/w. 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage & Loss) Act, 1992.

5.The petitioners have stated that they have settled the dispute with the *de facto* complainant/R2 amicably and hence, seek to quash the First Information Report. They have also filed affidavits to that effect.



Crl.O.P.No.3837 of 2026

6.The petitioners and the *de facto* complainant/R2 appeared before this Court and were identified by their respective counsel as well as Mr.A.Arunraj, GR I 810, Jolarpet Police Station, Tirupattur District.

7.On being enquired by this Court, the *de facto* complainant stated that she has amicably settled the dispute with the petitioners and she is not willing to pursue the criminal proceedings and therefore, seeks to quash the same.

8.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing on behalf of the first respondent submitted that though the parties have entered into a compromise while this case is pending, this Court, taking into account the seriousness of the offences, has to consider the issue as to whether offences of this nature can be quashed on the ground of compromise between parties.

9.The main issue that requires the consideration of this Court is as to whether this Court can quash the criminal proceedings involving non-compoundable offences pending against the petitioners. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of ***Parbathbhai Aahir @ Parbathbhai Vs. State of Gujarat***, reported in (2017) 9 SCC 641, has given sufficient guidelines that must be taken into consideration by this Court while exercising its



Crl.O.P.No.3837 of 2026

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 if the crime in question is purely individual in nature or a crime against the society with overriding public interest. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that offences against the society with overriding public interest even if they get settled between the parties, cannot be quashed by this Court.

10.In the present case, the offences in question are purely individual/personal in nature. It involves dispute between the petitioners and the second respondent and quashing the proceedings will not affect any overriding public interest in this case and no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the criminal proceedings.

11.In view of the above, this Court is inclined to quash the First Information Report registered in Crime No.426 of 2020 pending on the file of the first respondent, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.

12.Accordingly, the First Information Report in Crime No.426 of 2020 pending on the file of the first respondent is quashed as against the



Crl.O.P.No.3837 of 2026

petitioners and this Criminal Original Petition is disposed of on condition that the petitioners jointly pay a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) as costs to the Tamil Nadu State Legal Services Authority (TNSLSA), High Court Campus, Chennai 600 104, within a period of one (1) week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.. The affidavits filed by the petitioners and the second respondent for compromising the offences shall form part of the records. Consequently, connected Crl.MP.No.2655 of 2026 is closed.

17.02.2026

dsm

Internet:Yes



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.3837 of 2026

To

1. The Inspector Police,
Jolarpet Police Station,
Vellore District.
(Now Tirupattur District)
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.3837 of 2026

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

dsn

***Crl.O.P.No.3837 of 2026
and Crl.MP No.2655 of 2026***

17.02.2026