



Crl.O.P(MD)No.20392 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 05.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

Crl.O.P(MD)No.20392 of 2025

- 1.Kaviyarasan
- 2.Karthikraja
- 3.Karuppasamy
- 4.Thanga Tamilselvan
- 5.Selvakumar
- 6.Mahendran
- 7.Thangapandi @Thangapandiyan ... Petitioners/A1 – A7

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by its Inspector of Police,
Jeyamangalam Police Station,
Theni District
(Crime No.301/2025) ... Respondent/Complainant
- 2.Vishnu ... Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned FIR in Crime No.301 of 2025 dated 18.10.2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police and to quash the same as illegal in so far as the petitioners are concerned.



Crl.O.P(MD)No.20392 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Vikram
For R1 : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar,
Government Advocate (Crl. side)
For R2 : Mr.Akilesh Sudhakar

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.301 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent Police Station, insofar as the petitioners are concerned.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the 2nd respondent/*defacto* complainant is a B.Com graduate residing in a village. On 17.10.2025, at about 09.00 a.m., while the *defacto* complainant went to theatre with his friend, and when he was near a tea shop, all the petitioners allegedly came to the said place, questioned him as to why he was standing there, scolded him, and subsequently attacked him. Based on the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant, the 1st respondent police registered a



Crl.O.P(MD)No.20392 of 2025

case for the offences under Sections 118(1), 191(2), 296(b), 115(2), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.301 of 2025.

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the 2nd respondent are residing in the same locality, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 17.11.2025 has been filed before this Court.

4. The petitioners and the 2nd respondent / defacto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.Jei Shankar, SSI, Jeyamangalam Police Station, Theni District. The *defacto* complainant has categorically stated that he does not wish to pursue the FIR against the petitioners. 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
1 2012 10 SCC 303



WEB COPY

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***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

² (2017) 9 SCC 641



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 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

³ (2019) 5 SCC 688



Crl.O.P(MD)No.20392 of 2025

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 FIR in Crime No.302 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed subject to the condition that each of the petitioners shall deposit an amount of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) to the District Legal Services Authority, Theni District. The joint compromise memo dated 17.11.2025 shall form part and parcel of this order.



Crl.O.P(MD)No.20392 of 2025

WEB COPY

11. The petitioners are directed to file a memo along with the photocopy of the receipt before the Registry on or before 13.02.2026. In the event of non-compliance with the order passed by this Court, the same shall stand automatically vacated. List the matter on 24.02.2026 for reporting compliance.

05.01.2026

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

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Jeyamangalam Police Station,
Theni District.
- 2.The District Legal Services Authority,
Theni District.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.20392 of 2025

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

gbg

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

Crl.O.P(MD)No.20392 of 2025

05.01.2026