



CRL OP(MD). No.3804 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.3804 of 2026

Vengadesan @ Venkatesan

...Petitioner / Sole Accused

Vs

1.The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Reddiarchatram Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.17 of 2026)

... 1st Respondent / Complainant

2.Moorthy

... 2nd Respondent / Defacto Complainant

3.Sri Yasashni

... 3rd Respondent / Victim

PRAYER :-

To call for the records in Crime No.17 of 2026 on the file of the first respondent police and Quash the same against the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Sathish Kumar

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

Mr.P.Suresh for R.2



CRL OP(MD). No.3804 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the FIR in Crime No.17 of 2026 on the file of the 1st respondent.

2. The gist of the allegations in the FIR is that the accused person drove his car in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against the second respondent Auto and caused injuries to him. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.17 of 2026 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioner for the offences under Sections 281, 125(a) of BNS. Seeking quashment of the FIR, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.

3. Admittedly, the petitioner, the second respondent and the victim are residing in the same locality, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 23.02.2026 has been filed before this Court.



CRL OP(MD). No.3804 of 2026

4. The petitioner, the second respondent / defacto complainant and the victim are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.U.Muthusamy, SSI, Reddiyarchathram Police Station, Dindigul District. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that he does not wish to pursue the proceedings against the petitioner 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

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303



CRL OP(MD). No.3804 of 2026

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

² 2017 (9) SCC 641

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



CRL OP(MD). No.3804 of 2026

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 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.



CRL OP(MD). No.3804 of 2026

10. Accordingly, the impugned FIR in Crime No.17 of 2026 on the file of the first respondent is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The joint compromise memo dated 23.02.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order.

25.02.2026

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No

pnn

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Reddiyarchatram Police Station,
Dindigul District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.3804 of 2026

L. VICTORIA GOWRI,J

pnn

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.3804 of 2026

Date : 25/02/2026