



Crl.O.P.No.4538 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 24.02.2026**

CORAM:

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

**Crl.O.P.No.4538 of 2026**  
**and Crl.M.P.No.3214 of 2026**

1. Vijayan
2. Gokul ... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The State represented by,  
The Inspector of Police,  
Perumbakkam Police Station,  
Chengalpattu District.  
(Crime No.456 of 2025)
2. A.Kavitha ... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita/Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records relating to Crime No.456 of 2025, on the file of the first respondent Police and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Simson Jayakumar  
For R1 : Mr.S.Santhosh  
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)  
Assisted by Mr.M.S.Rajkumar  
For R2 : Ms.G.S.S.Sitara &  
Ms.S.Gayathri



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.4538 of 2026

## **ORDER**

The present Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the proceedings in Crime No.456 of 2025, on the file of the first respondent police, pending against the petitioners, on the basis of the compromise arrived at between the petitioners and the *de facto* complainant/second respondent.

2. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

3. Based on the complaint given by the *de facto* complainant/R2, the aforesaid case in Crime No.456 of 2025 was registered on the file of the first respondent Police against the petitioners/accused, for the offences under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 117(1) and 351(2) of the BNS and Section 4 of the TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002, which is now sought to be quashed.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as for the second respondent/*de facto* complainant submitted that the petitioners and the *de facto* complainant are relatives and that due to a



misunderstanding, the present complaint was lodged. However, on the advice of elders, the parties have now amicably settled the issue among themselves and that a Joint Memo of Compromise to that effect has also been filed. Hence, they seek to quash the First Information Report as against the petitioners.

5. The petitioners and the *de facto* complainant/R2 appeared before this Court and they were identified by their respective counsel.

6. 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.

7. Learned Government Advocate (Criminal 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.



WEB COPY

8. The main issue that requires the consideration of this Court is as to whether this Court can quash the criminal proceedings involving non-compoundable offence 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 jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. (corresponding to Section 528 BNSS), to quash non-compoundable offence. 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.

9. In the present case, the offence in question is 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. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to quash all the further proceedings pending against the

4/6



Crl.O.P.No.4538 of 2026

petitioners pertaining to Crime No.456 of 2025, registered by the first respondent police, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 528 BNSS.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and the case in Crime No.456 of 2025, pending on the file of the first respondent police, is quashed as against the petitioners.

11. The Joint Memo of Compromise filed by the petitioners and the second respondent for compromising the offences shall form part of the records. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

**24.02.2026**

*ham*

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

1. The Inspector of Police,  
Perumbakkam Police Station,  
Chengalpattu District.
2. The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.4538 of 2026

**A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.**

*ham*

***Crl.O.P.No.4538 of 2026  
and Crl.M.P.No.3214 of 2026***

***24.02.2026***