



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23-07-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

CRL OP No. 18757 of 2026

and

CrI.MP.Nos.12497 & 12498 of 2026

Thunesan Krishnamurthy

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State Rep By,
The Inspector of Police
R9, All Women Police Station,
Valasaravakkam, Chennai – 600 087.
Crime No.13 of 2024.

2. Priya Devakumar

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: This criminal original petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS to call for the records and quash the charge sheet in CC.No.117 of 2025 pending disposal on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate, Poonamallee, Chennai – 600 056 and to pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and necessary in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.A.P.Sathya Murthy

For Respondent(s):

Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side) For R1



ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition seeks to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.117 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Poonamallee, Chennai, for alleged offences under Sections 69, 316(2), 318(2), 351(3) of BNS r/w 3(5) BNS r/w 66(E) IT Act & 4 of TNPHW Act, 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 are that there was a betrothal arrangement between accused No.1 and the de facto complainant. Subsequently, due to the developments, it was called off stating that



misrepresentations was made and they were made to spend huge amounts on that there was also a physical cohabitation in the meanwhile and thereafter, the complaint was filed. Subsequently, it is now submitted that the parties have moved on and the defacto complainant has also since married a 3rd person and submits that in her own best interest, the case need not be continued. The parties have also ironed out the differences between them. For all the above reasons, it can be concluded that the offence is private in nature between the parties.

4. Thus, it can be seen that this matter is a fit case for the exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction to quash the case on compromise.

5. Accordingly, this CrI.O.P. No.18757 of 2026 shall stands allowed. The proceedings in C.C.No.117 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Poonamallee, Chennai, stands quashed in its entirety. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

23-07-2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
sms



WEB COPY

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Poonamallee, Chennai.
2. The State Rep By, The Inspector of Police
R9, All Women Police Station,
Valasaravakkam, Chennai – 600 087.
Crime No.13 of 2024
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 18757 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

sms

CRL OP No. 18757 of 2026
and
Crl.MP.Nos.12497 & 12498 of 2026

23-07-2026