



Crl.O.P(MD)No.461 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

Crl.O.P(MD)No.461 of 2026

and

Crl.M.P(MD)No.477 of 2026

Balaji

... Petitioner/Sole Accused

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by its Inspector of Police,
Thuvarankurichi Police Station,
Trichy District
(Crime No.51/2024)

... Respondent/Complainant

2.Ramamoorthi

... Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records of CC.No.249 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Manapparai and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sankarapandian

For R1 : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

For R2 : Mr.M.K.Sachin Rahul



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.461 of 2026

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the Chargesheet in C.C.No.249 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Manapparai, insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 08.03.2024 at about 9:30 p.m., the petitioner was riding a TVS Sport motorcycle bearing Registration No.TN-81-X-1479 on the Trichy-Madurai National Highway near Athupatti Flyover. The petitioner allegedly drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner, lost control, and collided with an iron barricade on the left side of the road, resulting in an accident. In the said accident, the pillion rider, Rathinam, sustained grievous head injuries and subsequently, succumbed to the injuries.

3. Admittedly, the petitioner and the 2nd respondent are known to each other, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 02.01.2026 has been filed before this Court.



WEB COPY

4. The petitioner and the 2nd respondent / defacto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by M/s.S.Mythili, SSI, Thuvrankurichi Police Station, Trichy District. The *defacto* complainant has categorically stated that he does not wish to pursue the FIR against the petitioner. This Court is satisfied that the compromise is voluntary and not the result of any coercion or undue influence.

5. The law relating to quashment of criminal proceedings on the basis of compromise between the parties is well settled. In ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab***¹, the Hon'ble Supreme Court authoritatively held that the inherent power of the High Court under Section 482 CrPC is of wide amplitude and may be exercised to quash criminal proceedings even in respect of non-compoundable offences, provided the dispute is essentially private in nature and the quashment would secure the ends of justice. The Court, however, drew a clear distinction between offences arising out of personal or matrimonial disputes, commercial transactions and similar private wrongs, and serious or heinous offences

¹ 2012 10 SCC 303



having grave impact on society, holding that the latter category cannot ordinarily be quashed merely on the basis of a settlement.

6. The said principles were succinctly crystallised in ***Parbatbhai Aahir v. State of Gujarat***², wherein the Supreme Court, after surveying the earlier precedents, laid down broad propositions governing the exercise of inherent jurisdiction on the basis of compromise. It was emphasised that the paramount consideration is whether the continuance of the criminal proceedings would be unfair or contrary to the interests of justice, and whether the dispute predominantly bears a civil or private character, rendering the possibility of conviction remote and bleak.

7. In State of ***Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan***³, the Supreme Court reiterated and clarified the limitations on such power, holding that offences of a serious nature, particularly those involving mental depravity, grave violence, or offences against society at large, cannot be

² (2017) 9 SCC 641

³ (2019) 5 SCC 688



quashed on the basis of compromise, even if the parties have amicably settled the dispute. The Court further cautioned that while examining compromise quash petitions, the High Court must consider the nature and gravity of the offence, the conduct of the accused, and the stage of the proceedings, and the overall impact on society and must satisfy itself that the settlement is voluntary and not the result of coercion or undue influence.

8. Applying the aforesaid principles to the facts of the present case, this Court has carefully examined the nature and gravity of the allegations, the relationship between the parties, the conduct of the petitioner, the stage of the proceedings, and the voluntary nature of the compromise.

9. The dispute in question is predominantly private in character and does not involve any offence having serious or grave impact on society at large. In view of the compromise arrived at between the parties, the possibility of conviction is rendered remote and bleak.



Crl.O.P(MD)No.461 of 2026

Continuation of the criminal proceedings would therefore serve no useful purpose and would amount to an abuse of the process of Court.

10. Accordingly, the impugned chargesheet in C.C.No.249 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Manapparai is quashed in entirety and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The joint compromise memo dated 02.01.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

09.01.2026

NCC : Yes

Index : Yes

Internet : Yes

gbg

Note : Issue order copy on 12.01.2026.

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate,
Manapparai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Thuvarankurichi Police Station,
Trichy District

3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.461 of 2026

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

gbg

Crl.O.P(MD)No.461 of 2026

09.01.2026