



CRL OP(MD). No.22886 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 02/01/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

CRL OP(MD). No.22886 of 2025

and

CRL MP(MD)Nos.19823 and 19824 of 2025

Mohamed Yasin

... Petitioner / Accused No.1

Vs

1. State of Tamilnadu Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Town North Police Station,
Dindigul District,
Crime No.822/2018.

... 1st Respondent / Complainant

2. Zareena Begum

... 2nd Respondent / defacto complainant

PRAYER :-

To call for the entire records pertaining to the Charge Sheet in Sessions Case No. 50 of 2022 dt. 20.08.2019 pending on the file of the learned Fast Track (Mahila) Sessions Judge, Dindigul and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner : Mr. C.M. Arumugam,
Advocate.

For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar for R1
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

Mr.K.Selvakumar for R2



CRL OP(MD). No.22886 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed seeking to quash the Charge Sheet in Sessions Case No. 50 of 2022 dt. 20.08.2019 pending on the file of the learned Fast Track (Mahila) Sessions Judge, Dindigul, insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that the petitioner / A1 got married to the daughter of the defacto complainant. Due to the wedlock they were blessed with a male child. There was a difference of opinion between them, alleging that the petitioner was in illegal relationship with another lady. The same was questioned by the daughter of the defacto complainant. Both the family members tried to settle the issue. But on 10.09.2018, the daughter of the defacto complainant had committed suicide by hanging herself at the residence of the second respondent. A case in Crime No.822 of 2018 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioner and two other accused persons for the offences under Sections 306 and 498 A of IPC and the same culminated in laying final report in Sessions Case No.50 of 2022 before the learned Fast Track (Mahila) Sessions Judge, Dindigul.

2/8



CRL OP(MD). No.22886 of 2025

Seeking quashment of the charge sheet, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.

3. Admittedly, the petitioner and the second respondent are known to each other and related as mother-in-law and son-in-law and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 02.01.2026 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 Mr.Govindarajan, SI, Town North Police Station, Dindigul. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that she does not wish to pursue the FIR against the petitioner. 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, the Hon'ble Supreme Court authoritatively held that the inherent power of the High Court under Section 482 CrPC is of wide



CRL OP(MD), No.22886 of 2025

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*, 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.



CRL OP(MD), No.22886 of 2025

7. In *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan*, 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.



CRL OP(MD), No.22886 of 2025

WEB COPY

9. The dispute in question is predominantly family dispute 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 charge sheet in Sessions Case No. 50 of 2022 dt. 20.08.2019 pending on the file of the learned Fast Track (Mahila) Sessions Judge, Dindigul, is quashed in entirety and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) to the credit of the District Legal Service Authority, Dindigul District, within a period of one week from today. The joint compromise memo dated 02.01.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions stand closed.



CRL OP(MD). No.22886 of 2025

WEB COPY

11. The petitioner is directed to file a memo along with the photocopy of the receipt before the Registry on or before **30.01.2026.**

List the matter on **03.02.2026**, for reporting compliance.

02.01.2026

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

pnn

To

1. The Fast Track (Mahila) Sessions Judge, Dindigul.
2. The Inspector of Police, Town North Police Station, Dindigul District, Crime No.822/2018.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.22886 of 2025

L.VICTORIA GOWRI,J

pnn

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD). No.22886 of 2025
and
CRL MP(MD)Nos.19823 and 19824 of 2025

Date : 02/01/2026