



CRL.OP(MD) NO.4222 of 2025

CrI.O.P(MD)No.4222 of 2025

WEB COPY **P.DHANABAL, J.**


Today the matter has been listed under the caption for being mentioned.

2. Since the 4th petitioner, namely, Sowmiya was not included in the order dated 14.03.2025 and the 2nd respondent counsel name was also wrongly mentioned as 'M.S.Pathipan' instead of 'M.S.Parthiban', the said typographical error has to be corrected.

3. In view of the above, Registry is directed to carryout necessary corrections and issue a fresh order copy.

22.04.2025

mac



CRL.OP(MD) NO.4222 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 14.03.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

CRL. O.P(MD) No.4222 of 2025

1. Nitin Krishna
2. Gopalkrishnan
3. Uma Mageshwari

... Petitioners

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by the Inspector of Police
AWPS Thilagar Thidal Police Station
Madurai. (Cr. No. 2 of 2024).

2. Kasthuri

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 to call for the records relating to the impugned charge sheet in C.C. No. 1593 of 2024 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate V, Madurai and quash the same as illegal.

For petitioners : Mr.Rahumanhussain.S

For Respondents : Mr. M.Vaikkam Karunanithi (R1)
Government Advocate (Crl Side)



CRL.OP(MD) NO.4222 of 2025

For R2

: Mr.M.S.Pathipan

WEB COPY

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the petitioners to call for the records pertaining to C.C.No.1593 of 2024 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court No.V, Madurai for the offences under Sections 498(A), 406, 506(1) IPC, in Crime No.2 of 2024 and quash the same.

2. According to the petitioners, the 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant are husband and wife and other petitioners are in-laws of the defacto complainant. Based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant, the police has registered FIR in Cr.No. 2 of 2024 for the offences under Sections 498(A), 406, 506(1) IPC.

3. When the matter was taken up for hearing, the learned counsel on both sides represented that during pendency of the case in C.C.No.1593 of 2024, the matter has been amicably settled between the parties and to that effect, they have entered into a compromise and the same was filed before this Court.

4. Today, the defacto-complainant and the 1st petitioner are present



CRL.OP(MD) NO.4222 of 2025

before this Court and the petitioners 2 to 4 were appeared through video conference and the Court enquired about the terms of compromise. The defacto-complainant represented that they entered into a compromise as 1st petitioner is her husband and there was a matrimonial dispute between them. A compromise memo, dated 14.03.2025 signed by the parties and their respective counsels, is also filed before this Court.

5. This Court has perused the terms of the compromise memo.

6. Considering the nature of the offences, the relationship between the parties and the parties have also entered into a compromise, it is appropriate to allow this petition.

7. Recording the said compromise memo, this petition is allowed and C.C.No.1593 of 2024 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, No.V, Madurai is quashed.

14.03.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
PNM



CRL.OP(MD) NO.4222 of 2025

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate V, Madurai

2.The Inspector of Police
AWPS Thilagar Thidal Police Station
Madurai. (Cr. No. 2 of 2024).

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

WEB COPY



WEB COPY



CRL.OP(MD) NO.4222 of 2025

P.DHANABAL,J

PNM

ORDER IN
CrI.OP(MD) No.4222 of 2025

14.03.2025