



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1512 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 17.02.2026

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1512 of 2026

1.Periyakarruppan @ Sudhakar

2.Panju

3.Praba Devi @ Praba

4.Karunanithi (Died) (26.07.2021)

5.Angalaeshwari @ Angu

6.Rathinam @ Ranjitha

7.Jagatheswari

... Petitioners / Accused Nos.1 to 7

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Aruppukottai,
Virudhunagar District.

... 1st Respondent / Complainant

2.Arulmozhi

... 2nd Respondent / De-facto
Complainant

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 to call for the records relating to the impugned final charge sheet report in C.C.No.388 of 2022 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Aruppukottai, in Crime No.9



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1512 of 2026

of 2020 on the file of the Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Aruppukottai and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Rajesh Kanna,
Advocate

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

For R2 : Mr.M.Vigneshwaran,
Advocate

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the charge sheet in C.C.No.388 of 2022 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Aruppukottai, insofar as the petitioners are concerned.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that the de-facto complainant married the 1st accused on 10.03.2019. Since there was misunderstanding, the de-facto complainant left the matrimonial home. Thereafter, on 15.03.2020, at about 9.00 p.m., the accused persons went to the de-facto complainant's house, abused her using filthy language, and assaulted her. The 2nd accused, who is the mother-in-law of the de-facto complainant, is said to have threatened the de-facto complainant. Pursuant to the complaint given by the de-facto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.9 of



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1512 of 2026

2020 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioners for the offences under Sections 498(A) and 355 of IPC r/w. Section 4 of TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002 r/w. Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, and the same culminated in laying final report in Sessions C.C.No.388 of 2022 before the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Aruppukottai, for the offences under Sections 498(A), 355, 406, & 506(1) of IPC r/w. Section 4 of TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002 r/w. Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961. Seeking quashment of the said charge sheet, this Criminal Original Petition has been filed.

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the second respondent are family members. Pending the case, the 4th petitioner, namely Karunanithi, died. They have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 18.12.2025 has been filed before this Court.

4. The petitioner Nos.1 to 3, 5 to 7 and the second respondent / de-facto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Ms.V.Vanaja, Head Constable, All Women Police Station, Aruppukottai, Virudhunagar District. The de-facto complainant has categorically stated that she does not wish to pursue the proceedings against the petitioners herein. This



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1512 of 2026

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 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

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303

² 2017 (9) SCC 641



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 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 petitioners, the stage of the proceedings, and the voluntary nature of the compromise.

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1512 of 2026

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 C.C.No.388 of 2022 before the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Aruppukottai, is quashed insofar as the petitioners are concerned and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The joint compromise memo dated 18.12.2025 shall form part and parcel of this order.

17.02.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
mkn



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1512 of 2026

WEB COPY

TO:-

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court,
Aruppukottai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Aruppukottai,
Virudhunagar District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1512 of 2026

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

mkn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1512 of 2026

Dated
17.02.2026