



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.2514 of 2026

- 1.Iyandurai @ Ayya Durai
- 2.Samuel
- 3.Balamurugan
- 4.Rajapandi
- 5.Vazhalakshmi @ Valalakshmi
- 6.Jeyalakshmi ... Petitioners/Accused No. 1 to 6

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
Sayalkudi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
(In Crime No.20 of 2020) ... Respondent/Complainant
2. Chinna Kannan ... Respondent/ Defacto Complainant
- 3.Rajapandi
- 4.Ramesh Kumar ... Respondents/Victims

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 to call for the records pertaining to the S.C.No.176 of 2025 on the file of the learned Additional District Judge, Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District, and to quash the same.



For Petitioners : Mr. A.Naresh Prabu
For Respondents : Mr. B.Thanga Aravindh (R1)
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
Mr. A.Mohamed Atif (R2 to R4)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the charge sheet in S.C.No.176 of 2025 on the file of the learned Additional District Judge, Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that, due to previous enmity, on 18.01.2020, at about 04.00 p.m, the petitioners are said to have attacked the complainant and the victims with an axe and also threatened them with dire consequence. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.20 of 2020 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioners and others for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324 & 506(2), 307, 326 & 149 of IPC, and the same culminated in laying final report in Sessions S.C.No.176 of 2025 before the learned Additional District Judge, Paramakudi,



Ramanathapuram District, for the aforesaid offences. Seeking quashment of the charge sheet, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the respondents 2 to 4 are residing in the same locality, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 23.01.2026 has been filed before this Court.

4. The petitioners and the the respondents 2 to 4 are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.N.Ravi Sankar, Head Constable, Sayalkudi Police Station, Ramanathapuram 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

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303



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.

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

² 2017 (9) SCC 641

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



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 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. Accordingly, the impugned final report in S.C.No.176 of 2025 on the file of the learned Additional District Judge, Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District, is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The petitioners shall pay a sum of Rs.3,000/- (Rupees Three Thousand 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 17.04.2026. The joint compromise memo dated 23.01.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order.

11. The petitioner is directed to file a memo along with the photocopy of the receipt before the Registry on or before 17.04.2026. List the matter on **20.04.2026**, for reporting compliance.

20.02.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
dss



WEB COPY

1. The Additional District Judge,
Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Sayalkudi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
3. 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.2514 of 2026

Dated
20.02.2026