



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 13.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

CrI.O.P.(MD).Nos.3032 of 2026
and CrI.M.P(MD).No.3287 of 2026

Karuppasamy

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu
rep., by the Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Sankarankovil,
Tenkasi District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Kuruvikulam Police Station,
Tenkasi District.
Crime No.19 of 2026

3.Gopi Balakrishnan

... Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records pertaining to the FIR in Crime No.19 of 2026 dated 15.01.2026 on the file of the second respondent police station and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.RMS.Sethuraman



For R1 & R2 : Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh
Government Advocate (Crl.side)
For R3 : Mr.Anbarasan

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the FIR in Crime No.19 of 2026 on the file of the second respondent police.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 15.01.2026 at about 04.30 pm., the defacto complainant along with his friends went to TASMAC Bar for consuming liquor, at that time, the accused persons also came there. Thereafter, a wordy quarrel arose between the defacto complainant and the accused persons, subsequently, the accused persons allegedly abused the defacto complainant by referring to his caste name, threatened him and also attacked him. Based on the complaint, FIR in Crime No.19 of 2026 came to be registered against the petitioner for the offences under Sections 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3)



of BNS, 2023 and Section 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of Schedule caste and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

3. Admittedly, the petitioner and the third respondent are residing in the same locality and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 02.02.2026 has been filed before this Court.

4. The petitioner and the third respondent / defacto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr. A. Ganesan, SSI, Kuruvikulam Police Station. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that he does not wish to pursue the FIR against the petitioner. 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***



WEB COPY

*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.

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

¹ 2012 10 SCC 303

² (2017) 9 SCC 641



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.

3(2019) 5 SCC 688



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 petitioner, 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 FIR in Crime No.19 of 2026 is quashed in entirety and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.5000/- 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. The joint compromise memo dated 02.02.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order.

Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

13.02.2026

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes / No

Rmk

To

- 1.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Sankarankovil,
Tenkasi District.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Kuruvikulam Police Station,
Tenkasi District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



L.VICTORIA GOWRI,J.,

Rmk

Crl.O.P.(MD).No.3032 of 2026

13.02.2026