



CRL OP(MD). No.1622 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 12/02/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE L. VICTORIA GOWRI

CRL OP(MD). No.1622 of 2026

1. Charles @ Charles Claiton,
2. Arun @ Arun Prathap,
3. Karuppaiah,
4. Dinakaran,
5. Jeeva,
6. Arunkumar,
7. Nanthakumar,
8. Santhosh @ Justin Santhosh,
9. Anbu @ Anburaj,
10. Aaron @ Aron,
11. Sam @ Samuvel,
12. Nisanth @ Nishanth,
13. Susai Prabakar @ Soosai Prabakaran,
14. Ganja Ganesh @ Ganesamoorthy, ... Petitioners



CRL OP(MD), No.1622 of 2026

Vs

1. Inspector of Police,
Kodaikanal Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(In Crime No. 339 of 2025)

2. Sathishkumar

3. Manikandan

4. Jawahar

5. Vignesh

... Respondents

PRAYER :-

To call for the records in FIR in Crime no.339 of 2025 on the file of the
1st Respondent and Quash the same.

For Petitioner : M/s D.S.Haroon Rasheed,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr. S. Ravi
Additional Public Prosecutor,

R2 : M/s Yasar Arafath

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC /
Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the FIR in Crime No.339 of 2025
on the file of the 1st respondent.



CRL OP(MD), No.1622 of 2026

WEB COPY

2. The gist of the allegations in the FIR is that the accused persons scolded the defacto complainant in filthy language, attacked him and his friends. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.339 of 2025 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioners for the offences under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) and 303(2) of BNS Act (Corresponding offence under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) and 379 of IPC. Seeking quashment of the FIR, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the second respondent have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 19.01.2026 has been filed before this Court.

4. The petitioners and the second respondent / defacto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.Rajamurugan, Kodaikanal Police Station, Dindigul District. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that he does not wish to



CRL OP(MD), No.1622 of 2026

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



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

² 2017 (9) SCC 641

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



CRL OP(MD), No.1622 of 2026

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 the dispute is private in nature 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 FIR in Crime No.339 of 2025 on the file of the first respondent is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. Each of the petitioners shall pay a sum of



CRL OP(MD), No.1622 of 2026

Rs.4,000/- (Rupees Four 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 27.02.2026. The joint compromise memo dated 19.01.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order.

11. The petitioners are directed to file a memo along with the photocopy of the receipt before the Registry on or before 27.02.2026. List the matter on 05.03.2026, for reporting compliance.

12.02.2026

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

pnn



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD), No.1622 of 2026

L. VICTORIA GOWRI,J

pnn

To

1. The Inspector of Police, Kodaikanal Police Station,
Dindigul District. (In Crime No. 339 of 2025)

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

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.1622 of 2026

Date : 12/02/2026