



CRL OP(MD). No.19759 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 16/02/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE L. VICTORIA GOWRI

CRL OP(MD). No.19759 of 2024
and
CRL MP(MD). No.12179 of 2024

S. Mohamed Kasim

... Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Tamilnadu Rep By,
The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Cheranmahadevi Sub Division,
Tirunelveli District..

2. State of Tamilnadu Rep By,
The Inspector of Police,
Munneerpallam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
Crime No.311/2014..

3. Sabarikumar

... Respondents

PRAYER :-

To Call for the entire records pertaining to the case in PRC No.1/2017 pending on the file of the Learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Tirunelveli and Quash the same as against the petitioners.

For Petitioner : M/s.Anand R.,



CRL OP(MD). No.19759 of 2024

Advocate.

WEB COPY

For Respondent : M/s.Thanga Aravindh.B
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

R3 : M/s.M.Sunil

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the charge sheet in PRC No.1/2017 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Tirunelveli, insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that the accused persons abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and attacked him. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / third respondent, a case in Crime No.311 of 2014 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioner and others for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 506(ii) of IPC and Section 3(2)(v) (a) and 3(1)(r), 3(1) of SC/ST Act, 2014, and the same culminated in laying final report in PRC No.1/2017 before the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Tirunelveli. Seeking quashment of the charge



CRL OP(MD). No.19759 of 2024

sheet, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.

WEB COPY

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 14.02.2026 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.Kumarasamy, SSI, Munneerpallam Police Station, Tirunelveli 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

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303



CRL OP(MD). No.19759 of 2024

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 the interests of justice, and whether the dispute predominantly bears a civil or private character, rendering the possibility of conviction remote and bleak.

² 2017 (9) SCC 641



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.

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.

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



CRL OP(MD). No.19759 of 2024

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. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Lovely Salhotra and another v. State (NCT of Delhi) and another***⁴, has held that where a clear offence is made out against the prime accused and no offence is made out against the peripheral accused, the Court can certainly consider quashing the charges against those accused, against whom no offence is made out.

11. Accordingly, the impugned PRC No.1/2017 before the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Tirunelveli, is quashed insofar as the petitioner is concerned and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen

⁴ AIR 2017 SC 2595



CRL OP(MD). No.19759 of 2024

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 14.02.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order.

11. The petitioner is 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 **06.03.2026**, for reporting compliance. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition stands closed.

16.02.2026

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

pnn



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.19759 of 2024

L. VICTORIA GOWRI, J

pnn

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.V, Tirunelveli

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Cheranmahadevi Sub Division,
Tirunelveli District..

3.The Inspector of Police,
Munneerpallam Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
Crime No.311/2014..

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

ORDER
IN

CRL OP(MD) No.19759 of 2024
and
CRL MP(MD). No.12179 of 2024

Date : 16/02/2026

8/8