



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.6196 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

CrI.O.P.No.6196 of 2026

1.Samvijay
2.Jaisingh

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.State rep. by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Sholingur Police Station,
Ranipet District.
(Crime No.291 of 2025)

2.Pandiyan

... Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS to quash the charge sheet/final report in C.C.No.599 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Sholinghur in view of the compromise between the parties.

For Petitioners : Mr.G.Kartheeban

For R1 : Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam
Additional Public Prosecutor



WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioners/accused facing trial in C.C.No.599 of 2025 before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Sholinghur for the offence under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) and 74 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, filed this quash petition.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 10.09.2025 at about 7.30 p.m., when the defacto complainant was sitting in an auto near his house, at that time, the second petitioner came there, abused him in filthy language, assaulted him on his face and further, attacked his left hand using iron rod, in which, the defacto complainant sustained injury. Thereafter, the defacto complainant was taken to Government Hospital, Sholinghur by his mother, at that itme, the first petitioner came there, abused the defacto complainant's mother in filthy language, slapped her and pushed her down. Hence, complaint was lodged. The respondent police registered FIR, recorded the statement of defacto complainant, his mother and other witnesses. On conclusion of investigation, charge sheet filed listing witnesses and documents.



WEB COPY

3.The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners is that the petitioners and the defacto complainant are related and residing in the same area. There was some previous family dispute between them which was questioned by the second petitioner with the defacto complainant which had been projected as though the defacto complainant was assaulted by the second petitioner, got injured and he went to the Hospital for treatment, where the first petitioner questioned the defacto complainant's mother, threatened and abused her. The family dispute has been magnified and projected as though the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant and threatened the defacto complainant's mother. He would further submit that now at the intervention of the elders and well-wishers, the issue has been resolved.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that in this case, the defacto complainant was sitting in an auto near his house, at that time, the second petitioner came there, questioned the defacto complainant as to why he lodged a complaint against his brother previously and there was a wordy quarrel. Thereafter the second petitioner assaulted the defacto



complainant, who sustained injuries was taken to the Hospital where the first petitioner came which was objected by the defacto complainant's mother and she was threatened and abused by the first petitioner. Later on the complaint of the defacto complainant, case registered in Crime No.291 of 2025 on 11.09.2025. On completion of investigation, charge sheet filed before the Trial Court on 16.02.2026.

5.Today, the petitioners and the defacto complainant appeared before this Court, their identity confirmed by the respondent police. During interaction in my Chamber, the petitioners and the defacto complainant confirmed that the issue between them got resolved amicably. The defacto complainant submitted that he is not willing to proceed with the case and ready to withdraw the case.

6.The petitioners and the defacto complainant filed confirming affidavits individually and a joint compromise memo. From the affidavits, it is seen that the petitioners and the defacto complainant were having good relationship and the issue between them got resolved amicably. Further, the defacto complainant is not willing to proceed with the case and he is ready



CrI.O.P.No.6196 of 2026

to withdraw the case. In view of the same, this Court finds that continuation of the proceedings will serve no purpose and it is only an abuse of process of law.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and as a sequel, the case in C.C.No.599 of 2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Sholinghur is hereby quashed. The petitioners are discharged from all charges.

11.03.2026

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order/Non Speaking Order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
cse

To

1. The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Sholingur Police Station,
Ranipet District.
2. The Judicial Magistrate,
Sholinghur.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6196 of 2026

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

cse

Crl.O.P.No.6196 of 2026

11.03.2026