



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : **20.02.2026**

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.979 of 2026

1.Uthiralingam

2.Chinna Kannan

3.Ramesh Kumar

4.Sivaraman @ Raman

5.Iyyamperumal @ Periyakannan

6.Rajapandi

... Petitioners/Accused No. 1 to 6

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
Sayalkudi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
(In Crime No.22 of 2020)

... Respondent/Complainant

2. Merry

... Respondent/ Defacto Complainant

3.Rajapandiyan

4.Jeyalakshmi

... Respondent/Victims



PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 to accept the compromise arrived between the accused and the defacto complainant/victims and to call for the records pertaining to the C.C.No.133 of 2022 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi, Ramanathapuram District, and to quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr. A.Naresh Prabu

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

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

Mr. A.Mohamed Atif (R2 to R4)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, seeking to quash the charge sheet in C.C.No.133 of 2022 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi, Ramanathapuram District.

2. The gist of the allegations in the final report is that, owing to agitation against the complainant's party with regard to eating food in the temple festival, on 18.01.2020, at about 04.15 p.m, the petitioners are said to have entered into the temple and attacked the complainant's party/respondents 3 & 4 and with an iron rod and also threatened them with dire consequence. Pursuant to the complaint given by the defacto complainant / second respondent, a case in



Crime No.22 of 2020 was registered on the file of the first respondent against the petitioners and others for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 323, 324 & 506(2) of IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act, and the same culminated in laying final report in Sessions C.C.No.133 of 2022 before the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi, Ramanathapuram District, for the aforesaid offences. Seeking quashment of the charge sheet, this Criminal Original Petition is filed.

3. Admittedly, the petitioners and the respondents 2 to 4 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 the respondents 2 to 4 are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.N.Ravi Sankar, Head Constable, Sayalkudi Police Station, Ramanathapuram District. The defacto complainant has categorically stated that she 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 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.

1 2012 (10) SCC 303

2 2017 (9) SCC 641



WEB COPY

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.

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

³ 2019 (5) SCC 688



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 final report in C.C.No.133 of 2022 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Kadaladi, Ramanathapuram District, is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The petitioners shall pay a sum of Rs.3,000/- (Rupees Three Thousand only) for establishing an E-Library to the credit of the MBHAA, in Indian Bank, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court Branch, Account No.496038755 IFSC No.IDIB000H040, MICR Code: 625019020, on or before 17.04.2026. The joint compromise memo dated 23.01.2026 shall form part and parcel of this order.

11. The petitioner is directed to file a memo along with the photocopy of the receipt before the Registry on or before 17.04.2026. List the matter on **20.04.2026**, for reporting compliance.

20.02.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
dss



WEB COPY



TO:-

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Kadaladi, Ramanathapuram District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Sayalkudi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

dss

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.979 of 2026

Dated
20.02.2026