



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22491 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 20.12.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22491 of 2024

Mahendran

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Batlagundu Police Station,
Dindigul District.
In Crime No. 101 of 2022.

2. Dhanalakshmi

3. Xxx

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records pertaining to the Charge Sheet in Spl.S.C. No. 140 of 2023 for an alleged offence under Sections 363 of IPC, Sections 5(1) r/w 6 of POCSO Act on the file of the Special Court for Exclusive Trial of cases under POCSO Act, Dindigul, and quash the same as illegal against the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Maran

For Respondent : Mr.K.Sanjai Gandhi (R1)
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

Mr.Samikannu (R2,R3)



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22491 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Spl.S.C. No.140 of 2023 on the file of the Special Court for Exclusive Trial of cases under POCSO Act, Dindigul.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner on the false promise of marrying the third respondent/victim girl, had physical relationship with her. On 17.02.2022, the petitioner took the victim to Palladam and had physical relationship with her. Hence the case has been registered based on the complaint given by the second respondent, who is the mother of the victim.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as the learned counsel appearing for the second and third respondents submitted that now, the petitioner and the third respondent/victim have settled the dispute between themselves amicably and the third respondent is not willing to proceed further with the criminal case.

4. Today, when the matter was taken up for hearing a joint



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22491 of 2024

Memo of Compromise filed before this Court signed by the petitioner and the third respondent and their respective counsels. The petitioner and the third respondent present before this Court, identified by Mr.K.Ramu, SSI, Batlagundu Police Station as well as by the learned counsels appearing for the parties. This Court enquired both the parties, satisfied that the parties have come to an amicable settlement between themselves on their own voluntarily without any compulsion.

5. The third respondent had stated that both the petitioner and the third respondent got married and they are living happily as husband and wife and she had intended to withdraw the complaint against the petitioner. She has also filed an affidavit in this regard.

6. The case has been registered for offences under Section 363 of IPC and Sections 5(1) and 6 of POCSO Act. It is settled law that the High Court has inherent power under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to quash the criminal proceedings even for the offences which are not compoundable under Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, where the parties have settled their dispute between



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22491 of 2024

themselves. However, while quashing the criminal proceedings, based on the settlement arrived at between the parties, the High Court should act with caution and the power should be exercised sparingly only in order to secure the ends of justice and also to prevent abuse of process of any Court.

7. Further, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***K.Dhandapani Vs. The State by the Inspector of Police*** reported in ***2022 SCC Online SC 1056***, has held as follows:

“In the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case, we are of the considered view that the conviction and sentence of the appellant who is maternal uncle of the prosecutrix deserves to be set aside in view of the subsequent events that have been brought to the notice of this Court. This Court cannot shut its eyes to the ground reality and disturb the happy family life of the appellant and the prosecutrix. We have been informed about the custom in Tamilnadu of the marriage of a girl with the maternal uncle”.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22491 of 2024

WEB COPY

8. The legal position expressed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another* reported in *(2012) 10 SCC 303* and *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Vs. State of Gujarat* reported in *(2017) 9 SCC 641* were taken into consideration.

9. Keeping the above principles in mind, let us now consider the instant case as to whether it is a fit case to quash the criminal proceedings based on the settlement arrived at between the parties.

10. In the case at hand, though the petitioner is charged with for the offences punishable under Section 363 of IPC and Sections 5(l) and 6 of POCSO Act, now, the petitioner and the third respondent/victim have amicably settled their dispute between themselves. The third respondent/victim has also filed an affidavit stating that she has married the petitioner. In view of the compromise between the parties, the possibility of conviction is also remote and bleak. In the above circumstances, continuity of the criminal proceedings would only cause oppression and prejudice to the parties, hence, in order to secure the ends of justice, this Court is inclined to quash the criminal proceedings.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22491 of 2024

WEB COPY

11. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioner in Spl.S.C. No.140 of 2023 on the file of the Special Court for Exclusive Trial of cases under POCSO Act, Dindigul, is quashed and the terms of joint compromise memo and affidavit filed by the third respondent shall form part and parcel of this order.

20.12.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
PNM

To

1. The Sessions Judge,
Special Court for Exclusive Trial of cases under POCSO Act, Dindigul

2.The Inspector of Police,
Batlagundu Police Station,
Dindigul District. In Crime No. 101 of 2022.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22491 of 2024

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

PNM

Order in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22491 of 2024

20.12.2024