



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : **27.02.2026**

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.3906 of 2026

1.Murugan
2.Sundara Rajan
3. Chinnaraju
4.Lingaraja

... Petitioner/Accused No.1 to 4

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu
rep by The Sub Inspector of Police
T.Kallupatti Police Station,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.93 of 2025)

...1st Respondent/Complainant

2. Sankarapandian

....2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records pertaining to of impugned charge sheet filed in C.C.No.161 of 2025 pending on the file of learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Peraiyur, Madurai District and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Chandrakumar

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

Mr.S.Rajendran for R2



ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the charge sheet in C.C.No.161 of 2025 pending on the file of learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Peraiyur, Madurai District.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that due to previous enmity, on 18.05.2025 the petitioners are said to have damaged the shutter door of the shop of the complainant and locked the same with a new lock and stolen 5 electric fuse carriers valued at about Rs.1000/- and further tried to kill the son of the complainant. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.23 of 2023 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioners and others for the offences under Sections 329(4), 324(4), 303(2) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023, and the same culminated in laying final report in C.C.No.161 of 2025 before the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Peraiyur, Madurai District, for the aforesaid offences. Seeking quashment of the charge sheet, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.



3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the second respondent are well known each other, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 26.02.2026 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 Mr.Murugan, Sub-Inspector of Police, T.Kallupatti Police Station, Madurai 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 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

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303



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 High Court must consider the nature and gravity of the offence, the conduct of

² 2017 (9) SCC 641

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



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 C.C.No.161 of 2025 pending on the file of learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Peraiyur, Madurai District, is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The petitioners shall pay a sum of Rs.3,000/- (Rupees Three



Thousand only) to the credit of the District Legal Services Authority, Madurai, on or before 17.04.2026. The joint compromise memo dated 26.02.2026 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 17.04.2026. List the matter on **20.04.2026**, for reporting compliance.

27.02.2026

1/2

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
dss

TO:-

1. The learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Peraiyur, Madurai District.
2. The Sub Inspector of Police
T.Kallupatti Police Station,
Madurai 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.3906 of 2026

Dated
27.02.2026