



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : **20.02.2026**

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1511 of 2026

and

Crl.MP(MD)No.1638 of 2026

Nanmaran

... Petitioner/Accused No. 4

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Melur Police Station,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.41 of 2016)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. P.Thirupathi

... 2nd Respondent/ Defacto Complainant

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 to call for the records in Crime No.41 of 2016 on the file of the 1st respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr. K.Ajith Kumar



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

Mr.M.Hari Prasanth (R2)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the FIR in Crime No.41 of 2016 on the file of the the Inspector of Police, Melur Police Station, Madurai District, and quash the same as illegal as against the petitioner is concerned.

2. The gist of the allegations in the FIR is that due to previous motive, on 17.01.2016 at about 10.45 p.m, the petitioner and the other accused persons are said to have abused the complainant in filthy language and threatened him with dire consequences and also attempted to snatch the amount from the complainant. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.41 of 2016 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioner and others for the offences under Sections 147, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) and 379 of IPC (Corresponding Sections 191(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(2), 351(2) and 303(2) of BSN, 2023). Seeking quashment of the FIR, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.



WEB COPY

3. Admittedly, the petitioner and the second respondent have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 18.02.2026 has been filed before this Court.

4. The petitioner and the second respondent / defacto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.A.Jeyakumar, B1 Melur Police Station, Madurai District. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that he does not wish to pursue the proceedings against the petitioner 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

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303



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.

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

² 2017 (9) SCC 641

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



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 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 no offence is made out against any accused, the Court can certainly consider quashing the charges against those accused, against whom no offence is made out.

⁴ AIR 2017 SC 2595



WEB COPY

11. Accordingly, the impugned FIR in Crime No.41 of 2016 on the file of the first respondent police is quashed insofar as the petitioner is concerned and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

20.02.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
dss

TO:-

1. The Inspector of Police,
Melur Police Station,
Madurai District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

dss

Order made in
CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1511 of 2026
and
CrI.MP(MD)No.1638 of 2026

Dated
20.02.2026