



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12-01-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.O.P.No.34116 of 2025

Jeyamurugan, S/o.Balasekaran
Plot No.13, Sai Residency Sakthi Nagar,
Sembakkam, Kancheepuram.

Petitioner

Vs

1. The State, Rep by its
Inspector of Police, CCB-I, CCB,
Chennai.

2.Bristan Sylva
Representing M/s.Wowtruck
Technologies Private Limited Having
its then office at 6th Floor, Spencer
Plaza, 769, Anna Salai, Mount Road,
Chennai - 600002. (No longer
employed)

3.S.Kishore, S/o.Srinivasan
Representing M/s.Wowtruck
Technologies Private Limited,
Having its then office at 6th Floor,
Spencer Plaza, 769, Anna Salai, Mount
Road, Chennai – 600002.
[Third respondent impleaded as per the
Order of this Court in Crl.M.P.No.468
of 2026 dated 12.01.2026 by ADJCJ]

Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Petition filed under section 528 of BNSS to call for the records
pertaining to the impugned FIR in Crime No.34 of 2024 dated 22.02.2024 on



the file of the first respondent police and to quash the same as illegal in so far as the petitioner is concerned.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Kannan

For Respondent: Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan,
Additional Public Prosecutor – R1

Ms.L.Sheela Devi – R2

Mr.V.Veerarghavan – R3

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the First Information Report registered in Crime No.34 of 2024 for the offences under sections 120B, 408, 420, 477A of IPC on the file of the first respondent.

2. The petitioner is A3 in this case. The case of the prosecution is that a complaint has been lodged against the petitioner and other accused stating that they had created fake customers and vendors using forged documents and entered into fictitious service agreements to generate false transportation demand and manipulated GST, on-boarding documents and emails to make fake transportations appear real and caused a loss of Rs.1,10,00,000/- to the company by siphoning off funds meant as advances to fake vendors.



3. When the matter was taken up today, the learned counsel appearing for petitioner submitted that there is a compromise arrived at between the petitioner and the third respondent and that the third respondent has no further claim or subsisting dispute against the petitioner and hence, the criminal proceedings pending in Crime No.34 of 2024 dated 22.02.2024 on the file of the first respondent may be quashed. In this regard, the petitioner had also filed a Joint Compromise Memo dated 12.01.2026 entered into between the petitioner and third respondent.

4. The petitioner and the third respondent were present before this Court at the time of hearing and the petitioner was identified by his counsel.

5. This Court also enquired both the parties and was satisfied that the parties have come to an amicable settlement between themselves.

6. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor 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.



7. 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 Gujrat*, reported in *2017 9 SCC 641* and in case of *The State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Dhruv Gurjar and Another* reported in *(2019) 2 MLJ Crl 10*, has given sufficient guidelines that must be taken into consideration by this Court while exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C./528 BNSS, 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 it gets settled between the parties, cannot be quashed by this Court.

8. In the present case, the offences in question are purely individual/personal in nature. It involves dispute between the petitioners and the de facto complainant 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.



9. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to quash the First Information Report registered against the petitioner in Crime No.34 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C./528 BNSS.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands disposed of and the First Information Report registered against the petitioner in Crime No.34 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent, is quashed subject to condition that the petitioner shall pay costs of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten Thousand Only), to the Tamil Nadu Advocates' Clerk Association, Chennai on or before 16.02.2026. The Joint Compromise Memo dated 12.01.2026 entered between the petitioner and the third respondent, shall form part of the records.

11. Post the matter on 16.02.2026 “for reporting compliance.”

12-01-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

vrc



CrI.O.P.No.34116 of 2025



To

1. Inspector of Police, CCB-I, CCB,
Chennai.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

WEB COPY



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.34116 of 2025



A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

VRC

Crl.O.P.No.34116 of 2025

12-01-2026