



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22212 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : **23.01.2026**

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22212 of 2025

Maideen Raja @ Mohideen Raja

... Petitioner/Sole Accused

Vs.

1. State of Tamilnadu Rep by
Inspector of Police,
Tallakulam Police Station,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.790/2024)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. Affrin Banu

... 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.2575 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court and to quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.SMA.Jinnah

For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar (R1)

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

Mr.S.Mohamed Riyal (R2)



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22212 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the charge sheet in CC No.2575 of 2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Madurai, insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that the petitioner dishonestly misappropriated the money and jewellery belonging to the de facto complainant, and when she demanded their return, the petitioner abused her in filthy language and criminally intimidated her. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.790 of 2024 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioner for the offences under Sections 406, 420, 294(b), 354B & 506(1) of IPC and the same culminated in laying final report in CC No.2575 of 2025 before the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Madurai, for the same offences. Seeking quashment of the charge sheet, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.



WEB COPY

3. Admittedly, the petitioner, the second respondent are known to each other, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 23.01.2026 has been filed before this Court.

4. The petitioner and the second respondent / defacto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Ms.A.Jayalakshmi, WSSI, Tallakulam Police Station, Madurai District. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that she do 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

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22212 of 2025

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.

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

² 2017 (9) SCC 641

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22212 of 2025

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.

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 CC No.2575 of 2025 before the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Madurai, is quashed



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22212 of 2025

and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) to the credit of the District Legal Services Authority, Madurai, on or before 13.03.2026. The joint compromise memo dated 23.01.2026 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 13.03.2026. List the matter on **16.03.2026**, for reporting compliance.

23.01.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Sm



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22212 of 2025

TO:-

WEB COPY

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Madurai.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Tallakulam Police Station,
Madurai District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22212 of 2025

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

Sm

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22212 of 2025

Dated
23.01.2026