



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1000 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : **30.01.2026**

CORAM:

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

CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1000 of 2026
& CrI.M.P.(MD)No.1043 of 2026

- 1.S.Andi
- 2.A.Karthick
- 3.P.Prathees
- 4.T.Palani

... Petitioners/Accused No. 1 to 4

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Mudukulathur Police Station,
Ramnathapuram District.
(Crime No. 278 of 2025)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. A.Santha

... 2nd Respondent/ Defacto Complainant

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 to call for the records pertaining to the impugned FIR in Crime No.278 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr. A.Jeyasudha

For Respondents : Mr. B.Thanga Aravindh (R1)

Government Advocate (CrI.Side)

Mr. S.Ramsundarvijayraj (R2)



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1000 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the FIR in Crime No.278 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent.

2. The gist of the allegations in the FIR is that the accused persons abused the de facto complainant in filthy language and criminally intimidated her. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in Crime No.278 of 2025 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioners for the offences under Sections 294(b), 115(2) & 351(3) of BNS, 2023. Seeking quashment of the FIR, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the second respondent are residing in the same locality, and they have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 23.01.2026 has been filed before this Court.

4. The petitioners and the second respondent / defacto complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.D.Muniasamy, Special Sub-Inspector of Police, Mudukulathur Police Station, Ramnathapuram



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1000 of 2026

District. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that he does not wish to pursue the proceedings against the petitioners 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 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

¹ 2012 (10) SCC 303

² 2017 (9) SCC 641



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 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

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1000 of 2026

relationship between the parties, the conduct of the petitioners, 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 FIR in Crime No.278 of 2025 on the file of the first respondent is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The joint compromise memo dated 23.01.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

30.01.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Sm



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1000 of 2026

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

Sm

TO:-

1. The Inspector of Police,
Mudukulathur Police Station,
Ramnathapuram District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Order made in
CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1000 of 2026

Dated
30.01.2026