



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : **20.02.2026**

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.2774 of 2026

and

Crl.MP(MD)No.3075 of 2026

1.Bose

2.David @ Davidraja

... Petitioners/Accused No.1 & 5

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Thiruppullani Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. N.Balaji

... 2nd Respondent/ Defacto Complainant

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 to call for the records pertaining to the impugned charge sheet in C.C.No.356 of 2019 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram, and quash the same as illegal in so far as the petitioners/Accused No.1 & 5 are concerned.

For Petitioners : Mr. J.Vishnu

For Respondents : Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh (R1)

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

Mr. M.Mathivanan (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.356 of 2019 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram, insofar as the petitioners are concerned.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that, on 18.10.2017 at about 10.15 p.m, when the complainant and others were standing near the Regunathapuram egg shop, the petitioners and others are said to have abused the complainant in filthy language and attacked him with a stick, a knife and an iron rod and also criminally intimidated him. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.162 of 2017 was registered on the file of the second respondent against the petitioners and others for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(B), 323 and 506(ii) of IPC (corresponding Sections 191(2), 191(3), 297, 115(2) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023), and the same culminated in laying final report in CC.No.356 of 2017 before the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram, 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 known to each other, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 19.02.2026 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 the Police Official of Thiruppullani Police Station, Ramanathapuram District. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that he do 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. 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.

⁴ AIR 2017 SC 2595



11. Accordingly, the impugned charge sheet in C.C.No.356 of 2019 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ramanathapuram, is quashed insofar as the petitioners are concerned and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. Each of the petitioners shall pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) to the credit of the District Legal Services Authority, Pudukkottai District, on or before 10.04.2026. The joint compromise memo dated 19.02.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

12. The petitioners are directed to file a memo along with the photocopy of the receipt before the Registry on or before 10.04.2026. List the matter on **15.04.2026**, for reporting compliance.

20.02.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
dss



WEB COPY



TO:-

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Ramanathapuram.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Thiruppullani Police Station,
Ramanathapuram 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.2774 of 2026
and
CrI.MP(MD)No.3075 of 2026

Dated
20.02.2026