



CRL OP(MD). No.3473 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 25/02/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE L. VICTORIA GOWRI

CRL OP(MD). No.3473 of 2026

1.Rangarajan

2.Baskaran

3.Radha

4.Karthick Raj

5.Sathish Raj

...Petitioners / Accused Nos.1 to 5

Vs

1.The State represented by

The Inspector of Police,

AWPS Sankaran Kovil Police Station,

Tenkasi District.

(Crime No.12 of 2025)

... 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent / Complainant

2.Biruntha @ Ishwarya

... 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent /Defacto Complainant

**PRAYER :-**

To call for the records pertaining to the Charge Sheet in C.C. No. 613 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Sivagiri for the offences Under Sections 85, 115(2), 131, 351(8) of BNS and Section 4 of TNPHW Act, the corresponding offence under Sections 498(A), 323, 352, 506(ii) of IPC and quash the same.



CRL OP(MD). No.3473 of 2026

For Petitioners : Mr.P.Sathish Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar for R1  
Government Advocate (Crl Side)

Mr.C.Venkatesh for R.2

### **ORDER**

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the charge sheet in C.C. No. 613 of 2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Sivagiri.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that the first petitioner was married to the second respondent on 08.09.2022 and after marriage, the petitioners abused the defacto complainant, harassed her and assaulted her with pipe and also threatened her with dire consequences.. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.12 of 2025 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioners and others for the offences under Sections 85, 115(2), 131, 351(2) of BNS and Section 4 of TNPHW Act and the same culminated in laying final report in Sessions C.C. No. 613 of 2025 before the file of the learned



CRL OP(MD). No.3473 of 2026

Judicial Magistrate Court, Sivagiri, for the offences under the same offences. Seeking quashment of the charge sheet, this Criminal Original

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the second respondent are residing in the same locality, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 24.02.2026 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 Ms.K.Nisha, Sankarankovil All Women Police Station, Tenkasi 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***<sup>1</sup>, the Hon'ble Supreme Court authoritatively

---

<sup>1</sup> 2012 (10) SCC 303



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***<sup>2</sup>, 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 2017 (9) SCC 641



WEB COPY

7. In *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan*<sup>3</sup>, 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.

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.

---

<sup>3</sup> 2019 (5) SCC 688



CRL OP(MD). No.3473 of 2026

WEB COPY

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 C.C. No. 613 of 2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Sivagiri, is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The joint compromise memo dated 24.02.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order.

**25.02.2026**

NCC : Yes/No  
Index : Yes / No  
Internet : Yes / No

pnn



CRL OP(MD). No.3473 of 2026

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court,  
Sivagiri.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,  
AWPS Sankaran Kovil Police Station,  
Tenkasi District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.3473 of 2026

**L. VICTORIA GOWRI,J**

pnn

**ORDER**  
**IN**  
**CRL OP(MD) No.3473 of 2026**

**Date : 25/02/2026**