



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.32298 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CrI.O.P.No.32298 of 2025

G.Madesh

S/o Ganesamoorthy

... Petitioner/Sole Accused

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police
D-Nagar Police Station,
Puducherry.(Crime No.95 of 2024).

... 1st respondent/Complainant

2.Dharani

D/o Chandirasekaran

.. 2nd Respondent/Defacto complainant

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. to call for the records in connection with the charge sheet in Spl.S.C.No.33 of 2024 pending on the file of the learned Special Judge under POCSO Act, 2012, Fast Track Court at Puducherry, and quash the same insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

For Petitioner : Ms.T.Lavanya

For Respondents : Mr.M.V.Ramachandra Murthy
Public Prosecutor, Puducherry
Assisted by Mr.A.Alexander,
Government Advocate, Puducherry for R1

Ms.Gayathri Vasudevan for R2



ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the charge sheet filed against the petitioner in Spl.S.C.No.33 of 2024 on the file of the learned Special Judge under the POCSO Act, 2012, Fast Track Court at Puducherry, for the offence punishable under Section 6 of the POCSO Act, 2012.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner and the victim/2nd respondent belong to the same locality and are known to each other from their childhood and a love affair and consequential consensual relationship developed between them. He would further submit that at the time of occurrence, the petitioner was aged about 18 years and the victim/2nd respondent was aged about 17 years and subsequently, after coming to know of their relationship, the parents of the petitioner as well as the victim had performed their marriage on 21.08.2025 at Arulmigu Devanatha Swami Temple, Thiruvanthipuram, as per the Hindu rites, custom and rituals and they are also taking steps to register their marriage at the SRO. As both the families have compromised on the issue, the petitioner has filed an affidavit to that effect and has filed the above criminal original petition seeking to quash the charge sheet filed against him on the ground of compromise.



CrI.O.P.No.32298 of 2025

3.The learned counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent/victim submitted that now, the petitioner and the victim/2nd respondent are living as husband and wife and the act between the parties was driven by love alone, rather than lust and she has no objection in the charge sheet filed against the petitioner being quashed and she has also filed an affidavit to that effect.

4.The learned Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the 1st respondent-Police 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 an offence of this nature can be quashed on the ground of compromise between parties.

5.The petitioner, his mother, victim, and her mother are present before this Court at the time of hearing. They were identified by their respective counsel as well as by Mr.A.Vinayagamoorthy, S.G. Sub Inspector of Police, Dhanvanthari Nagar Police Station, Puducherry.

6.The parties have filed a joint Memo of Compromise dated 14.11.2025 entered into between the petitioner and the 2nd respondent/victim and they have filed separate affidavits dated 14.11.2025 else. The mothers

3/10



CrI.O.P.No.32298 of 2025

of the petitioner and the 2nd respondent/victim have also filed separate affidavits dated 01.12.2025.

7.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 petitioner.

8.The Supreme Court, in a very recent judgment in **K. Kirubakaran vs. State of Tamil Nadu [2025 INSC 1272]**, in which the appellant was convicted for the offences under Sections 366 IPC and Section 6 of the POCSO Act, pursuant to the compromise entered into between the parties, by commencing the judgment with the quote *“The final cause of law is the welfare of society” of Benjamin N. Cardozo, Former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States*, and finding that the crime was not the result of lust but love, quashed the proceedings against the appellant invoking Section 142 of the Constitution of India. The relevant paragraphs of the said judgment read as under:

“5. The only question which remains to be decided is whether the proceedings should be quashed in the present case, considering that the appellant is convicted of a heinous offence.

6. We are conscious of the fact that a crime is not merely a wrong against an individual but against society as a whole. When an offence is committed, it wounds the collective conscience of the society and therefore the society, acting through its elected



WEB COPY

lawmakers, determines what would be the punishment for such an offence and how an offender should be dealt with, to deter its recurrence. The criminal law is, thus, a manifestation of the sovereign will of the society. However, the administration of such law is not divorced from the practical realities. Rendering justice demands a nuanced approach. This Court tailors its decisions to the specifics of each case: with firmness and severity wherever necessary and it is merciful when warranted. It is also in the best interest of society to bring a dispute to an end, wherever possible. We draw inspiration from Cardozo, J. to hold that the law aims to ensure not just punishment of the guilty, but also harmony and restoration of the social order.

7. With such perspective in mind, we need to proceed to balance the competing interests of justice, deterrence, and rehabilitation.

8. The founding fathers of the Constitution conferred this Court with the extraordinary power to do “complete justice” in proper cases. This constitutional power stands apart from all other powers and is intended to avoid situations of injustice being caused by the rigid application of law.

9. Per the law made by the legislature, the appellant having been found guilty of a heinous offence, the proceedings in the present case on the basis of a compromise between the appellant and his wife cannot be quashed. But ignoring the cry of the appellant’s wife for compassion and empathy will not, in our opinion, serve the ends of justice. Even the most serious offenders of law do receive justice moderated by compassion from the courts, albeit in appropriate cases. Given the peculiar facts and circumstances here, a balanced approach combining practicality and empathy is necessary. The appellant and the victim are not only legally married, they are also in their family way. While considering the offence committed by the appellant punishable under the POCSO Act, we have discerned that the crime was not the result of lust but love. The victim of crime herself has expressed her desire to live a peaceful and stable family life with the appellant, upon whom she is dependent, without the appellant carrying the indelible mark on his forehead of being an offender. Continuation of the criminal proceedings and the appellant’s incarceration would only disrupt this familial unit and cause irreparable harm to the victim, the infant child, and the fabric of society itself.

10. We are, thus, persuaded to hold that this is a case where the law must yield to the cause of justice.



WEB COPY

11. Accordingly, resting on the foregoing considerations, the developments subsequent to the trial, and in the interest of rendering complete justice, we deem it appropriate to invoke our powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India to quash the criminal proceedings against the appellant including the conviction and sentence. Ordered accordingly.

12. Also, bearing in mind the interests of the appellant's wife and child, we deem it appropriate to subject the appellant to the specific condition of not deserting his wife and child and also to maintain them for the rest of their life with dignity. If, in future, there be any default on the appellant's part and the same is brought to the notice of this Court by his wife or their child or the complainant, the consequences may not be too palatable for the appellant.

13. We make the interim order granting benefit to the appellant of exemption from surrendering absolute and discharge him from the bail bonds.

14. The appeal is, accordingly, allowed.

15. Needless to observe, this order is rendered in the unique circumstances that have unfolded before us and shall not be treated as a precedent for any other case.”

(emphasis supplied by this Court)

9.It is also apropos to point out that the Supreme Court, in **K.Dhandapani vs. The State [2022 LiveLaw (SC) 477]**, in which the appellant was convicted of the offences under Sections 5 and 6 of the POCSO Act, by a terse order, set aside the conviction and sentence slapped on the appellant, on the basis of the settlement arrived at between the parties. The following relevant paragraphs of the said order make an interesting reading:

“The appellant submitted that this Court should exercise its power under [Article 142](#) of the Constitution and ought to do complete justice and it could not be in the interest of justice to disturb the family



life of the appellant and the prosecutrix.

After hearing the matter for some time on 08th March, 2022, we directed the District Judge to record the statement of the prosecutrix about her present status. The statement of the prosecutrix has been placed on record in which she has categorically stated that she has two children and they are being taken care of by the appellant and she is leading a happy married life.

Dr. Joseph Aristotle S., learned counsel appearing for the State, opposed the grant of any relief to the appellant on the ground that the prosecutrix was aged 14 years on the date of the offence and gave birth to the first child when she was 15 years and second child was born when she was 17 years. He argued that the marriage between the appellant and the prosecutrix is not legal. He expressed his apprehension that the said marriage might be only for the purpose of escaping punishment and there is no guarantee that the appellant will take care of the prosecutrix and the children after this Court grants relief to him.

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 Tamil Nadu of the marriage of a girl with the maternal uncle.

For the aforesaid mentioned reasons, the conviction and sentence of the appellant is set aside in the peculiar facts of the case and shall not be treated as a precedent. The appeal is accordingly, disposed of. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

In case, the appellant does not take proper care of the prosecutrix, she or the State on behalf of the prosecutrix can move this Court for modification of this Order.”

(emphasis supplied by this Court)

10. Since the aforesaid decisions apply on all fours to the facts and circumstances obtaining in this case, this Court is inclined to quash Spl.S.C.No.33 of 2024 on the file of Special Judge under POCSO Act, 2012, Fast Track Court, Puducherry, against the petitioner, for the offence

7/10



Crl.O.P.No.32298 of 2025

punishable under Section 6 of the POCSO Act, 2012, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C./528 of the BNSS.

11. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and Spl.S.C.No.33 of 2024 on the file of Special Judge under POCSO Act, 2012, Fast Track Court, Puducherry, is quashed. This Courts hopes and trusts that the petitioner will take due care of the victim for the rest of her life and in the event of any default on his part in this regard being brought to the notice of this Court, the consequences that would befall the petitioner would be very serious. The affidavits and joint memo of compromise dated 14.11.2025 filed by the parties for compromising the offence, shall form part of the records.

12. Before parting, this Court hastens to add that this Court is not oblivious of the fact that the Supreme Court, in **K. Kirubakaran**, *supra*, had invoked Article 142 of the Constitution of India and quashed the criminal proceedings against the appellant. However, since the facts obtaining in this case being akin to the facts in **K. Kirubakaran**, *supra*, this order is passed.



CrI.O.P.No.32298 of 2025

13. Learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that the petitioner is G.Madesh, S/o Ganesamoorthy. However, in the petition, the petitioner's initial has been incorrectly cited as 'R'. He would submit that the initial of the petitioner may be corrected as 'G' and the order copy may be issued accordingly.

14. Acceding to his request, the Registry is directed to carry out the aforesaid correction and issue order copy showing the petitioner as 'G.Madesh' instead of 'R.Madesh' as stated in the petition.

01.12.2025

raa

To

1. The Special Judge under POCSO Act, 2012,
Fast Tract Court, Puducherry.
2. The Inspector of Police
D-Nagar Police Station,
Puducherry.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.32298 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA J.

raa

Crl.O.P.No.32298 of 2025

01.12.2025