



Crl.O.P(MD)No.77 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

Crl.O.P(MD)No.77 of 2026

1.Nathiya
2.Karuppasmay
3.Muthuraj
4.Alagumuthu

... Petitioners/A1 - A4

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by its Inspector of Police,
Saptur Police Station,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.6/2025)

... Respondent/Complainant

2.Pounthai

... Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned FIR in Crime No.6 of 2025 dated 13.01.2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioners : Mr.C.Selvakumar

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



Crl.O.P(MD)No.77 of 2026

WEB COPY

For R2 : Mr.K.Kannan

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 BNSS, seeking to call for the records pertaining to the impugned FIR in Crime No.6 of 2025 dated 13.01.2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police and quash the same as illegal.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 1st petitioner, who is the daughter-in-law of one Muniyandi (the brother-in-law of the 2nd respondent), had earlier been advised by the said Muniyandi not to go out unnecessarily, which advice had no connection whatsoever with the son of the *defacto* complainant. In furtherance of the said incident, on 04.01.2025 at about 7:00 a.m., when the *defacto* complainant and her son, Karuppasamy, were present at their residence, the petitioners allegedly abused them using filthy language, assaulted them with deadly weapons, namely an aruval (sickle) and an iron rod, causing injuries. Thereafter, the injured persons were taken to the Government



Hospital, Peraiyur. Based on the complaint lodged by the 2nd respondent / *defacto* complainant, the respondent police registered the present FIR against the petitioners in Crime No.6 of 2025 for the offences under Sections 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023.

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the 2nd respondent are relatives, have now resolved the dispute amicably. A Joint Compromise Memo dated 08.01.2026 has been filed before this Court.

4. The petitioners and the 2nd respondent / *defacto* complainant are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.G.Ganesan, SSI, Saptur Police Station, Madurai District. The *defacto* complainant has categorically stated that she does not wish to pursue the FIR against the petitioners. This Court is satisfied that the compromise is voluntary and not the result of any coercion or undue influence.



WEB COPY

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

¹ 2012 10 SCC 303

² (2017) 9 SCC 641



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.

³ (2019) 5 SCC 688



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.

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 F.I.R in Crime No.6 of 2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police station is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed subject to the condition that each of the petitioners shall deposit an amount of Rs.5,000/- to the District Legal



Crl.O.P(MD)No.77 of 2026

Services Authority, Madurai District. The joint compromise memo dated 08.01.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order.

11. The petitioners are directed to file a memo along with the photocopy of the receipt before the Registry on or before 20.02.2026. In the event of non-compliance with the order passed by this Court, the same shall stand automatically vacated. List the matter on **23.02.2026** for reporting compliance.

09.01.2026

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

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Saptur Police Station,
Madurai District.
- 2.The District Legal Services Authority,
Madurai District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.77 of 2026

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

gbg

Crl.O.P(MD)No.77 of 2026

09.01.2026