



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.23836 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.23836 of 2025

Sarathkumar @ Narendraprabu

... Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

1. State of Tamilnadu Rep by
Inspector of Police,
Paramakudi Taluk, Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
(Crime No.111/2017)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. Chanthiran,

... 2nd Respondent/ Defacto Complainant

3. Vinoth,

4. Banumathi

5. Pandiyammal
(Respondents 2 to 5 are
Residing at Pandikanmai
Paramakudi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.)

... Respondents 3 to 5/Victims

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 to call for the records in SC No.288/2022 pending on the file of Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram and quash the same as against the petitioner and pass such further orders as this Honble Court...



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.23836 of 2025

For Petitioner : M/S.K.Muthuvai Ilayaraja
For Respondents : M/S.M.Sakthi Kumar (R1)
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
Mr.R.Vinoth (R2 to R5)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the charge sheet in S.C.No. 288 of 2022 on the file of the learned Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram, insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that, due to previous enmity, the petitioner and others abused the victims / respondents 3 to 5 and assaulted them, thereby causing injuries. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.111 of 2017 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioner and others for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 of IPC and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002 and the same culminated in laying final report in S.C.No. 288 of 2022 before the file of the learned Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram, for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 341, 294(b), 323, 324, 307, 325 of



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.23836 of 2025

IPC and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002. Seeking quashment of the charge sheet, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.

3. Admittedly, the petitioner, the second respondent and the victims are residing in the same locality, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 22.11.2025 has been filed before this Court.

4. The petitioner and the second respondent / defacto complainant and the victims are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.K.Karthikeyan, SSI, Paramakudi Town Taluk Police Station, Ramanathapuram District. The defacto complainant and the victims have categorically stated that they 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

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.23836 of 2025

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 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.

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

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.23836 of 2025

proceedings would therefore serve no useful purpose and would amount to an abuse of the process of Court.

10. Accordingly, the impugned S.C.No. 288 of 2022 before the file of the learned Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram, is quashed insofar as the petitioner is concerned and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The joint compromise memo dated 22.11.2025 shall form part and parcel of this order.

23.01.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Sm



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.23836 of 2025

TO:-

WEB COPY

1. The Judge,
The Fast Track Mahila Court, Ramanathapuram.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Paramakudi Taluk, Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.23836 of 2025

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

Sm

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.23836 of 2025

Dated
23.01.2026