

Navin Kumar Vs The State Rep.by, The Inspector of Police,

Navin Kumar Vs The State Rep.by, The Inspector of Police,

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1425669

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Feb-25-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice a.D.Jagadish Chandira

Appeal No. : CRL OP/4230/2026

Appellant : Navin Kumar

Respondent : The State Rep.by, The Inspector of Police,

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25.02.2026

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA 1.Navin Kumar
2.Sathiyaraj 3.Yuvaraj 4.Mohan 5.Kodishvaran Petitioners/Accused (A1 to A5) Vs.

1. The State Represented by The Inspector of Police, Rasipuram Police Station,
(Crime No.810 of 2020) ... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. Kavimani ... 2nd Respondent/De-facto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita to call for the records in C.C.No.402 of 2025, pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Rasipuram, Namakkal District and quash the same. For Petitioners : Mr.D.Senthil Kumar For R1 : Mr.S.Vinoth Kumar, Government Advocate (Crl.Side) For R2 : Mr.D.Jegan

ORDER

The present Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.402 of 2025, pending against the petitioners, on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Rasipuram, Namakkal, on the basis of the compromise arrived at between the petitioners and the de facto complainant/second respondent.

2. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

3. Based on the complaint given by the de facto

complainant/R2, a case in Crime No.810 of 2020 was registered on the file of the first respondent Police against the petitioners, for the offences under Sections 147, 294(b), 324, 323 and 506(II) of IPC.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as for

the de facto complainant submitted that on the advice of elders, the parties have now amicably settled the issue among themselves. Hence, they seek to quash the proceedings as against the petitioners. Joint Memo of Compromise to that effect has also been filed.

5. The petitioners and the de facto complainant/R2 appeared before this Court and they were identified by their respective counsel.

6. On being enquired by this Court, the de facto complainant

stated that he has amicably settled the dispute with the petitioners and he is not willing to pursue the criminal proceedings and therefore, seeks to quash the same.

7. Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing on

behalf of the first respondent submitted that though the parties have entered into a compromise while this case is pending, this Court, taking into account the seriousness of the offence, has to consider the issue as to whether offences of this nature can be quashed on the ground of compromise between parties.

8. The main issue that requires the consideration of this Court is

as to whether this Court can quash the criminal proceedings involving non-compoundable offences pending against the petitioners. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of Parbathbhai Aahir @ Parbathbhai Vs. State

of Gujarat, reported in (2017) 9 SCC 641, has given sufficient guidelines

that must be taken into consideration by this Court while exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. (corresponding to Section 528 BNSS), to quash non-compoundable offences. One very important test that has been laid down is that the Court must necessarily examine if the crime in question is purely individual in nature or a crime against the society with overriding public interest. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that offences against the society with overriding public interest even if they get settled between the parties, cannot be quashed by this Court.

9. In the present case, the offences in question are purely

individual/personal in nature. It involves dispute between the petitioners and the second respondent and quashing the proceedings will not affect any overriding public interest in this case and no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the criminal proceedings. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.402 of 2025 pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Rasipuram, Namakkal District, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands disposed of and the proceedings in C.C.No.402 of 2025 pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Rasipuram, Namakkal District is quashed as

against the petitioners, on condition that the petitioners pay a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) jointly as costs to the Tamil Nadu State Legal Services Authority (TNSLSA), High Court Campus, Chennai 600 104, within a period of two (2) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

11. The Joint Memo of Compromise filed by the petitioners and the second respondent for compromising the offences shall form part of the records.
25.02.2026 vm Neutral Citation: Yes/No To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Rasipuram,

2. The Inspector of Police, Rasipuram Police Station,

3. The Member Secretary, The Tamil Nadu State Legal Services Authority (TNSLSA), High Court Campus, Chennai.

4. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

vm 25.02.2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com