



Crl.O.P(MD)No.23017 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 06.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

Crl.O.P(MD)No.23017 of 2025

1.Mayakrishnan
2.Sathiyamoorthi
3.Saravanakumar
4.Ganesan

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by its Inspector of Police,
Bazaar Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District
(Crime No.99/2025)

... Respondent/Complainant

2.Muthukumar

... Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records relating to the impugned charge sheet in C.C.No.904 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Ramanathapuram and quash the same as against the petitioners.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Arun Prasad

For R1 : Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh
Government Advocate (Crl. side)



Crl.O.P(MD)No.23017 of 2025

For R2 : Mr.V.Chandrapandi

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the charge sheet in C.C.No.904 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Ramanathapuram, insofar as the petitioners are concerned.

2. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity between the petitioners and the defacto complainant, on 20.04.2025, the petitioners had waylaid the defacto complainant and attacked using iron rod and wooden log. Hence, F.I.R in Crime No.99 of 2025 was registered on the file of the 1st respondent for the offences under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(3) and 118(2) of BNS, 2023, which culminated in filing a final report in C.C.No.904 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Ramanathapuram.

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 12.12.2025 has been filed before this



Court. This Court is satisfied that the compromise is voluntary and not the result of any coercion or undue influence.

4. 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 heinous offences having grave impact on society, holding that the latter category cannot ordinarily be quashed merely on the basis of a settlement.

5. The said principles were succinctly crystallised in ***Parbatbhai Aahir v. State of Gujarat***², wherein the Supreme Court, after surveying

¹ 2012 10 SCC 303

² (2017) 9 SCC 641



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.

6. 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

³ (2019) 5 SCC 688



Crl.O.P(MD)No.23017 of 2025

itself that the settlement is voluntary and not the result of coercion or undue influence.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. When the matter is taken up for hearing on 19.12.2025, this Court has passed the following order :



Crl.O.P(MD)No.23017 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. Considering the nature of the offences,

(i) each of the petitioners in Crl.O.P.(MD).No.23017 of 2025 is directed to deposit a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) as a non-refundable deposit to the credit of the Adyar Cancer Institute (Union Bank of India, Name: Cancer Institute (WIA), Account No. 149710011005477, IFSC Code: UBIN0814971), Chennai;.....

4. The aforesaid amount shall be deposited on or before 22.01.2026. 5. Today, the petitioners and the defacto complainant are present before this Court and their further appearance of the parties is dispensed with.”

10. When the matter is taken up for hearing today, it is informed that the order of this Court dated 19.12.2025 has been complied with and the payment of receipt has also been produced before this Court.

11. Accordingly, the impugned chargesheet in C.C.No.904 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Ramanathapuram is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The joint



Crl.O.P(MD)No.23017 of 2025

compromise memo dated 12.12.2025 shall form part and parcel of this order.

06.02.2026

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

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.1,
Ramanathapuram.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Bazaar Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.23017 of 2025

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

gbg

Crl.O.P(MD)No.23017 of 2025

06.02.2026