



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1810 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : **30.01.2026**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI**

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1810 of 2026
& Crl.M.P.(MD)No.2011 & 2012 of 2026

- 1.Rickson
- 2.Rabin Singh
- 3.Arockya Josekalan @ Arokia Joskalan
- 4.Anthony Siluvai Kitheriyan @ Antony Siluvai Kitheriyan
- 5.Arulappan Kitheriyan ... Petitioners/Accused No.2 to 6

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Koodankulam Police Station,
Tiruenelveli District.
(Crime No. 579 of 2024) ... 1st Respondent/Complainant
2. Anthony Arockiya Snathiyagu ... 2nd Respondent/ Defacto Complainant

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 to call for the records in CC No.481 of 2025 pending on the file of the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District and quash the same in respect of the petitioners concerned.

For Petitioners : Mr. S.Micheal Heldon Kumar
For Respondents : Mr. M.Sakthi Kumar (R1)
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
Mr. S.Prabhakaran (R2)



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1810 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the charge sheet in CC No.481 of 2025 on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District, insofar as the petitioners are concerned.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that the accused persons abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and attacked them with iron rod and also criminally intimidated him. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.579 of 2024 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioners and others for the offences under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 329(4), 296(b), 115(2), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 and the same culminated in laying final report in CC No. 481 of 2025 before the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District, for the same offences. Seeking quashment of the charge sheet, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the second respondent are known to each other, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 29.01.2026 has been filed before this Court.



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1810 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. The petitioners and the second respondent / defacto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.Sekar Mani, Special Sub Inspector of Police, Koodankulam Police Station, Tirunelveli District. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that he does not wish to pursue the proceedings against the petitioners herein. 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 having grave impact on society, holding that the latter category cannot ordinarily be quashed merely on the basis of a settlement.

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1810 of 2026

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 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.

² 2017 (9) SCC 641

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1810 of 2026

WEB COPY

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

10. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in *Lovely Salhotra and another v. State (NCT of Delhi) and another*⁴, has held that where a clear offence is made out against the prime accused and no offence is made out against the peripheral accused, the Court can certainly consider quashing the charges against those accused, against whom no offence is made out.

⁴ AIR 2017 SC 2595



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1810 of 2026

11. Accordingly, the impugned CC No. 481 of 2025 before the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District, is quashed insofar as the petitioners are concerned and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. Each of the petitioners shall pay a sum of Rs.2,500/- (Rupees Two Thousand Five Hundred only) for establishing an E-Library to the credit of the MBHAA, in Indian Bank, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court Branch, Account No.496038755 IFSC No.IDIB000H040, MICR Code: 625019020, on or before 13.03.2026. The joint compromise memo dated 29.01.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order.

12. The petitioners are directed to file a memo along with the photocopy of the receipt before the Registry on or before 13.03.2026. List the matter on **16.03.2026**, for reporting compliance. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

30.01.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Sm



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1810 of 2026

TO:-

WEB COPY

1. The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Koodankulam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1810 of 2026

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

Sm

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1810 of 2026

Dated
30.01.2026