



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRL OP No. 34098 of 2025

and

CRL MP Nos.23839 and 23840 of 2025

1. Pradeep

2. Latha

Petitioners

Vs

1. The State Rep. by the Inspector of
Police,
Mathur Police Station,
Krishnagiri, District.
(Crime No.369 of 2024)

2.Suguna,

3.xxxxxx

xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxx Krishnagiri District.

Respondents

PRAYER

Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita to call for the records and quash the final report in Spl.S.C.No.30 of 2025 on the file of Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Krishnagiri District.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Selvam



For Respondents: Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan
Additional Public Prosecutor
For R1

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed to call for the records and quash the final report in Spl.S.C.No.30 of 2025 on the file of Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Krishnagiri District.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the first petitioner and the victim girl are residents of the same village and they are known to each other for a long time. There was a consensual relationship between them and since it was opposed to by the *de facto* complainant/second respondent, mother of the victim, a case came to be registered. Coming to know about the relation, an objection was raised by the second respondent, mother of the victim. Later, the first petitioner and the victim eloped from their home and they were staying in the house of the second petitioner, who is the aunt of the first petitioner. Later, based on the complaint given by the second respondent, a case in Crime No.16 of 2023 was registered for the offences under Section 366 of IPC and Sections 7 read with 8 & Sections 11(v) read with 12 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act by the first respondent police.



3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that now the families have patched up and the first petitioner has married the victim at Sakthi Vinayakar Thiru Kovil, Maniyakaranpalayam, Ganapathy (E) & (W)., Coimbatore North, Coimbatore, on 22.11.2025 and the marriage is also registered at the office of the Marriage Officer/SRO, Ganapathi on 27.11.2025. The first petitioner and victim are living as husband and wife and they have also filed a joint compromise memo and hence, the impugned proceedings against the petitioners may be quashed on the ground of compromise.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the first petitioner had kidnapped the victim when she was a minor and a case came to be registered. There was a physical relationship between them and a case was registered under the POCSO Act as aforesaid. However, he would submit that the first respondent understands that the first petitioner has married the victim and they are living as husband and wife under one roof.

5. The petitioner and the victim girl and the de facto complainant were present before this Court at the time of hearing and they were identified by their counsel and parents of the first petitioner. They also admitted to the marriage between them and they are living together as husband and wife.



6. This Court also enquired both the parties and was satisfied that the petitioner and the victim girl are living together as husband and wife and their marriage has also been registered before the Marriage Officer/SRO, Ganapathi on 27.11.2025.

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.



WEB COPY



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 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 the proceedings against the petitioner in Spl.S.C.No.30 of 2025 on the file of Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Krishnagiri District, by invoking Section 482 of Cr.P.C./ 528 BNSS.

11. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the



proceedings against the petitioner in Spl.S.C.No.30 of 2025 on the file of Sessions Judge, Fast Track Mahila Court, Krishnagiri District, is quashed.

Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

12. The consent affidavit of the de facto complainant and the Joint Compromise Memo signed by the parties dated 12.12.2025, for compromising the offences, shall form part of the records.

13. This Courts hopes and trusts that the petitioner will take due care of the victim girl and the child for the rest of their 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.

14. 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.

12-12-2025

Index:Yes/No



Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
mrn

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Mathur Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.
(Crime No.369 of 2024)

2. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 34098 of 2025



A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
mrn

CRL OP No. 34098 of 2025

12-12-2025