

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-07-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

CRL OP No. 18957 of 2026

1. Akash
2. Parvathi
3. Pavithra
4. Santhosh Devi
5. Deepak
6. Sankari

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Chengalpattu, Chengalpattu District.
Crime No. 10 of 2024.

2. Jaysree

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: This criminal original petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS to call for the records relating to S.C.No.171 of 2026 on the file of the Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Chengalpattu and Quash the same on compromise.

For Petitioner(s):


MR.M.RAJKUMAR

For Respondent(s):

MR.M.MOHAMED RIYAZ
GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
(CRIMINAL SIDE) FOR R1

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition seeks to quash in S.C.No.171 of 2026 on the file of the Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Chengalpattu for alleged offences under Sections 417, 376(2)(n), 313 of IPC, 74, 115(2), 127(2), 296(b), 351(3) of



BNS, on the ground of compromise between the parties. The parties are present before the court and, on examination, stand by their compromise and do not want the case to proceed further.

2. The broad contours of the High Court's power to exercise extraordinary jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.p.c. and Section 528 of the BNSS in respect of compromise of non-compoundable offences are laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Gian Singh -Vs- State of Punjab and Another (2012 10 SCC 303)* and other subsequent judgments.

3. The gist of facts leading to the instant case or the background facts, in which, the case arises, are that the de facto complainant and the first accused were in a relationship and pursuant to that it is alleged that there were physical intercourse on the promise of marriage. The other accused are the family members of the first accused.

4. Considering the allegations, it can be seen that there was no force or enticement that was involved and it was a long standing relationship between the parties. The de facto complainant is present before this court and submits that she has moved on in life and in her own best interest, the case should be quashed.



5. I am of the view that this case can be termed as private in nature, so as to exercise the jurisdiction of this court. Thus, it can be seen that this matter is a fit case for the exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction to quash the case on compromise.

6. Accordingly, this Crl.O.P. No.18957 of 2026 stands allowed. The proceedings in S.C.No.171 of 2026 on the file of the Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Chengalpattu, stands quashed.

17-07-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

sms

To

1. The Sessions Judge, Mahila Court,
Chengalpattu.
2. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Chengalpattu, Chengalpattu District.
3. The Public prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 18957 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

sms

CRL OP No. 18957 of 2026

17-07-2026