



CRL OP(MD). No.878 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 20/01/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE L. VICTORIA GOWRI

CRL OP(MD). No.878 of 2026

1. P.Vengudusamy @ Venkidusamy
2. S.Senthilkumar @ Senthil
3. V.Chinnasamy @ Chinnu
4. Jayapandi

... Petitioners

Vs

1. State of Tamilnadu Rep by
Inspector of Police,
Vedasandur Police Station,
Dindigul District.
Crime No.380 of 2025.

2. Rubiya Banu

... Respondents

PRAYER :-

To call for the records pertaining to the Crime no.380 of 2025 dated 23.10.2025 on the file of 1st Respondent Police and Quash the same.

For petitioners : Mr. S.Sudhanthiran,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh for R1
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

Mr.R.Karthik Rajan for R2



CRL OP(MD). No.878 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition is filed to call for the records pertaining to the Crime no.380 of 2025 dated 23.10.2025 on the file of first respondent police and quash the same.

2. This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the First Information Report in Crime No. 380 of 2025 on the file of the first respondent Police Station, insofar as the petitioners are concerned.

Brief facts of the case :

3. There is a property dispute between the petitioners and the defacto complainant. On 23.10.2025 at about 7 p.m., the petitioners alleged to have broke open the vacant house near the house of the defacto complainant, having liquor, abused the defacto complainant in intoxicated mode and demanded her to vacate the house and also criminally intimidated her. It is alleged that the petitioners have damaged the CCTV camera installed in the house of the defacto complainant. Hence the present case came to be filed.



CRL OP(MD), No.878 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. Admittedly, the petitioners and the second respondent are known to each other residing in the same locality and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 09.01.2026 has been filed before this Court.

5. The petitioners and the second respondent / defacto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Ms.A.Amala, WSSI, Vedasanthur Police Station, Dindigul City. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that she does not wish to pursue the FIR against the petitioners. This Court is satisfied that the compromise is voluntary and not the result of any coercion or undue influence.

6. 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

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303



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

7. 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.

8. In ***State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan***³, the Supreme Court reiterated and clarified the limitations on such power,

² 2017 (9) SCC 641

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



CRL OP(MD). No.878 of 2026

holding that offences of a serious nature, particularly those involving mental depravity, grave violence, or offences against society at large, cannot be 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.

9. 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 petitioners, the stage of the proceedings, and the voluntary nature of the compromise.

10. 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 OP(MD), No.878 of 2026

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

11. Accordingly, the impugned FIR in Crime No.380 of 2025 is quashed in entirety and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The petitioners shall deposit a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only)** [Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) EACH] to the District Legal Services Authority, Dindigul District, within a period of one week from today. The joint compromise memo dated 09.01.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order.

12. The petitioners is directed to file a memo along with the photocopy of the receipt before the Registry on or before 13.02.2026. List the matter on 18.02.2026, for reporting compliance.

20.01.2026

NCC : yes / no
Index : yes / no
Internet : yes /no

pnn



CRL OP(MD). No.878 of 2026

To

WEB COPY

1. The Inspector of Police, Vendasandur, Police Station,
Dindigul District. Crime No.380 of 2025.

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



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.878 of 2026

L. VICTORIA GOWRI, J

pnn

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.878 of 2026

Date : 20/01/2026