



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28-07-2026

CORAM

WEB COPY


THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

CRL OP No. 34472 of 2025

1. Arulmurugan
S/o. Saravanan,
2. Saravanan
S/o. Santhaiyya,
3. Shanthi
W/o. Saravanan

1 to 3 are residing at
No.6, Thamari Vinayagar Kovil Street,
Sanjay Gandhi Colony, MGR nagar,
Chennai-76.

4. Karthika
W/o. Viswanathan,
No.2, Arignar Anna Street,
MGR Nagar, Chennai-78.
5. Balamurugan
s/o. Saravanan,
No.2, Valaiyabathi Street,
MGR Nagar, Chennai.
6. Vel Murugan
S/o. Saravanan ,
No.6, Tamarai Vinayagar kovil Street,
Sanjay Gandhi Colony,
MGr Nagar, Chennai-78.
7. Sathya
W/o. Rajkumar,
No.236, G Block, T.V.K. Kudiyiruppu,
Teynampet, Chennai.



8. Roja
W/o. Manas,
No.354, J Block, T.V.K.Colony,
Teynampet, Chennai.

9. Viswanathan
S/o. Periyathambi,
No.2, Arignar Anna Street,
MGR Nagar, Chennai-78.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu rep by The Inspector
of Police
W-24, All Women Police Station,
Teynampet.
Crime No.4 of 2025.

2. Usha
Social Welfare Officer,
South Chennai District,
Singaravelar Mallikai,
Chennai-01.

3. Xxxx
Chennai District.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Criminal Original Petition filed under Sec.528 of B.N.S.S. 2023, praying to call for the records relating to the Spl.S.C.No.95 of 2025 on the file of the Sessions Judge (Magalir Neethimandram), at Chennai and quash the same.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. N.Saravanan

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Rajasekaran,
Counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu
(Criminal Side) For R1




ORDER

WEB COPY

1. This Criminal Original Petition seeks to quash the proceedings in Spl.S.C.No.95 of 2025 on the file of the Sessions Judge (Magalir Neethimandram), Chennai for alleged offences under Sections 5(i), (ii) r/w 6 of the *Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012*, (the POCSO Act) and Sec.9, 10 of Prohibition of Child Marriage 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. This is a serious case under the POCSO Act, with societal ramifications. As such, the Court will not rely solely on the version of the victim child/Prosecutrix but has a duty to consider the entire gamut of facts and attendant circumstances.



4. The following circumstances of this case are borne in mind :

WEB COPY

- (A) A careful perusal of the allegations does not reveal a forceful assault or enticement under direct or indirect pressure, but the offence arises out of a premature adolescent romantic relationship rooted in mutual innocence and biological attraction;
- (B) The victim child's date of birth is taken into account, and she has now turned a major;
- (C) It is submitted that the accused and the victim are married, share an emotional bond, and live as a family;
- (D) They have a child born to them;
- (E) The accused is working in a private finance company and the family is eking out a lawful livelihood.

5. The fact that the prosecutrix or the family members are no longer interested in the prosecution, that they are not going to co-operate with the prosecution, and that there is no likelihood of a meaningful trial is also taken into account.

6. This Court, in *Vijayalakshmi and Another -Vs- State (2021 SCCOnline Mad 317)*, has already taken the view that such adolescent relationships should not



result in the incarceration of the boy alone and has called for appropriate legislative action to deal with these cases separately.

WEB COPY

7. The purpose of exercising extraordinary power is to maintain social order. The very purpose behind the POCSO Act will be lost if the trial is allowed to proceed in the instant case, which is, pure and simple, a private relationship between the accused and the victim child.

8. For all the above reasons, Crl.O.P. No.34472 of 2025, is allowed. The proceedings in Spl.S.C.No. 95 of 2025 on the file of the Sessions Judge (Magalir Neethimandram), Chennai stands quashed.

28-07-2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

RPP

To

1. The Sessions Judge (Magalir Neethimandram), Chennai.
2. The Inspector of Police, W-24, All Women Police Station, Teynampet.
3. Usha, Social Welfare Officer,
South Chennai District, Singaravelar Mallikai,
Chennai-01.
4. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 34472 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY J.

RPP

CRL OP No. 34472 of 2025

28-07-2026