



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 13.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **SHAMIM AHMED**

CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

C. Balasubramanian
S/o.Chellappan
Andipalayam Veerarangiyam Post
Krishnarayapuram Taluk
Karur District.

... Petitioner

vs.

Ramesh
S/o.Kandasamy
Andipalayam
Veerarakkiam Post
Krishnarayapuram Taluk
Karur District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Petition is filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the entire records of the Judgment dated 06.10.2022 made in STC.No.10/2021 on the file of District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram by partly allowing the Judgment dated 24.07.2024 made in C.A.No.12/2023 on the file of the Principal District Court, Karur.



WEB COPY



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

For Petitioner :Ms.S.Mahalakshmi

For Respondent :Mr.V.S.Kumaraguru

ORDER

Heard Ms.S.Mahalakshmi, learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner and Mr.V.S.Kumaraguru, learned Counsel for the Respondent and also this Court has taken the assistance of Mr.A.S.Abul Kalam Azad, learned Government Advocate.

2.This Criminal Revision Petition has been filed by the Revision Petitioner to set aside the judgment passed by the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, in STC.No.10 of 2021, vide judgment, dated 06.10.2022, as partly confirmed by the Principal District Court, Karur, in C.A.No.12 of 2023 vide judgment, dated 24.07.2024.

3. The facts of the case in a nutshell, led to filing of this Criminal Revision Petition and necessary for disposal of the same, are as follows:-

a) The Petitioner was convicted and sentenced for the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, by the learned



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, in STC.No.

10 of 2021, by the judgment dated 06.10.2022, to undergo one year simple imprisonment for the offence alleged under Section 138 of Negotiable Instrument Act and to pay a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- as compensation to the Respondent, in default of payment, he has to undergo a further period of three months simple imprisonment and to pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- towards fine, in default of payment of fine, to undergo a further period of three months simple imprisonment. Aggrieved by the order of the Trial Court, the Petitioner had filed a Criminal Appeal in C.A.No.12 of 2023 before the Principal District Court, Karur.

b) The learned Principal District Judge, Karur, modified the judgment of the trial Court in respect of compensation alone and directed the Revision Petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- as compensation to the Respondent and in all other aspects, the judgment passed by the trial Court was confirmed. Aggrieved by the same, the present Criminal Revision Petition has been filed.



4. When the matter was taken up on 23.10.2025, this Court passed the following order:

“The Criminal Revision Petition is filed to call for the entire records of the judgment dated 06.10.2022 made in STC No.10 of 2021 on the file of the learned District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram by partly allowing the judgment dated 24.07.2024 made in C.A.No.12 of 2023 on the file of Principal District Court, Karur.

2. The Petitioner was convicted and sentenced for the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, by the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, vide order dated 06.10.2022 in S.T.C.No. 10 of 2021, to undergo imprisonment for 12 months and to pay a sum of Rs.10,00,000/-, being the cheque amount to the Respondent in default of payment of the said amount, to undergo further period of imprisonment for three months and also to pay the fine amount of Rs.5000/-, in default of payment of fine, to undergo period of imprisonment for three months. As the Petitioner has paid Rs.1,25,000/-, before the Trial Court and thereafter the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Karur in Criminal Appeal No.12 of 2023, dated 24.07.2024, modified the judgment of the Trial Court in respect of compensation alone and directed the Revision Petitioner to pay Rs.5,00,000/- as compensation to the Respondent and in other aspects, the judgment passed by the Trial Court is confirmed.



3. Heard Mrs.S.Mahalakshmi, learned counsel for the Petitioner and Mr.Karnan, learned Counsel for Mr.V.S.Kumaraguru, learned counsel for the Respondent.

4. This Court vide order dated 25.09.2025 passed the following order:

“3.When the matter is taken up for hearing, Mr.P.Rajagopalan, learned counsel for the Petitioner requests that some time be granted to to make compliance of the order dated 17.09.2025 passed by this Court in the present Criminal Revision Petition and prays for two weeks and no more further time to make compliance of the order dated 17.09.2025 passed by this Court in the present Criminal Revision Petition. He further submits that he will bring the demand draft in favour of the Respondent to the tune of Rs. 3,75,000/- (Rupees Three Lakh Seventy Five Thousand only) befo.re this Court on the next date fixed.

4. Mr.V.S.Kumaraguru, learned counsel for the Respondent stated that he has no objection to the prayer made by the learned counsel for the Petitioner.

5. Accordingly, this Court grants two weeks and no more further time to the learned counsel for the Petitioner to bring the demand draft in favour of the Respondent in favour of the Respondent to the tune of Rs.3,75,000/- (Rupees Three Lakh Seventy Five Thousand only) before the Court on the next date fixed.



WEB COPY

6. Put up this case on 23.10.2025 “For Orders” before the appropriate bench.”

5. Today, when the matter is being taken up in the revised call, Ms.S.Mahalakshmi, learned Counsel submits that now she is leading the case in the place of Mr.P.Rajagopalan, learned Counsel for the petitioner and on the instructions from her client, she submits that the Revision Petitioner is ready to bring the demand draft to the tune of Rs.3,75,000/- in the name of the Respondent on the next date fixed. Hence, she requests this Court to grant further time to comply the order dated 25.09.2025 passed by this Court. The learned Counsel for the petitioner also prays that, on such payment, this Court by exercising power under Section 147 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, may compound the offence.

6. Mr.Karnan, learned Counsel for Mr.V.S.Kumaraguru, learned Counsel for the respondent submits that he has no objection if the Revision Petitioner brings the demand draft to the tune of Rs.3,75,000/- in favour of the Respondent on the next date fixed, so that the matter may be settled.

7. Accordingly, after considering the arguments as advanced by the learned Counsel for the parties and the submission made by the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner that the Revision petitioner is ready to bring the demand draft to the tune of Rs.3,75,000/- (Rupees Three Lakh



WEB COPY



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

Seventy Five Thousand only) in favour of the Respondent, this Court grants ten days and no more further time to the Revision Petitioner to bring the demand draft in favour of the Respondent, without fail. The parties are directed to appear in person before this Court along with their respective learned Counsel and to file a compromise memo in this regard on the next date fixed.

8.Put up this case “for orders” on 13.11.2025 before this Court.”

5.In compliance of the order passed by this Court, dated 23.10.2025 in the present Criminal Revision Case, the parties have entered into a Memorandum of Compromise dated 13.11.2025, which is taken on record and the Petitioner viz., C.Balasubramanian, and the Respondent viz., Ramesh, appeared before this Court today. As per the terms of the Compromise, the following conditions were laid down between the parties which are quoted as under:

“2.It is respectfully submitted that this Honourable Court, by order dated 23.10.2025, was pleased to record the submissions of both parties that the matter has been settled, and directed the petitioner to pay the remaining compensation amount of Rs. 3,75,000/- (Rupees Three Lakhs Seventy Five Thousand



Only) in favour of the Respondent, this Court grants ten days, and also directed both parties to file a compromise memo in this regard.

3.It is respectfully submitted that, the respondent/complainant filed before the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, Karur, under section 138 and 142 of the Negotiable Instruments Act and it is stated that, the petitioner/accused borrowed a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- from the respondent/complainant for his urgent family and business expenses.

4.It is respectfully submitted that as per the direction issued by the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, vide order dated 06.10.2022 in S.T.C.No. 10 of 2021, wherein the Petitioner/Accused is directed to pay compensation amount of Rs.10,00,000/- to the Respondent/Complainant, and thereafter the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Karur in Criminal Appeal No.12 of 2023, dated 24.07.2024, modified the judgment of the Trial Court and directed the Petitioner to pay Rs.5,00,000/- as compensation to the respondent.

5.The petitioner has already deposited a sum of Rs.1,25,000/-(Rupees One Lakh Twenty Five Thousand



Only) before the Trial Court on 17.02.2023. The Petitioner has now paid balance amount Rs. 3,75,000/- to the respondent by way of Demand Draft No.143311 dated 12.11.2025 drawn on Canara Bank, Thanthoni Branch, Karur in full and final settlement of the entire claim of Rs.5,00,000/-.

6. The respondent hereby acknowledges receipt of the aforesaid amount Rs. 1,25,000/- and confirms that he has no further monetary claim against the petitioner in respect of the transaction forming the subject matter of S.T.C.No. 10 of 2021, and in connection with Crl.R.C.(MD).No.1033 of 2025. Based on the receipt of the Demand Draft No.143311 dated 12.11.2025 drawn on Canara Bank, Thanthoni Branch, Karur and upon withdrawal of the earlier deposited amount of Rs.1,25,000/-, respondent/complainant in Crl.R.C.(MD).No. 1033 of 2025 agrees to treat the entire claim of Rs.5,00,000/- as fully settled. In the event of failure to comply with the above undertaking, the petitioner shall be entitled to work out his remedies in accordance with law.

7. Both parties have amicable settled the dispute voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. They jointly agree that the matter may be compounded under section 147 of the Negotiable



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

Instruments Act, 1881, and appropriate orders may be passed in this Criminal Revision Petition to give effect to the compromise.

It is therefore humbly prayed that this Honourable Court may be pleased to record the above compromise, Compound the offence under Section 147 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, to Set aside the conviction and sentence imposed on the petitioner, and to dispose the above Criminal Revision Petition in terms of the compromise, and pass such further or other orders as this Honourable Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case and thus render justice.”

6.The learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 23.10.2025 passed by this Court, both the parties have entered into a Joint Memorandum of Compromise dated 13.11.2025 to the effect that the Criminal Revision case shall be settled in accordance with the terms and conditions as contained therein.

7.Learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner further submits that out of total compensation amount to the tune of Rs.5,00,000/-, as per the



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

judgment made in C.A.No.12 of 2023, dated 24.07.2024, on the file of the Principal District Court, Karur, the Petitioner has already deposited a sum of Rs.1,25,000/- before the trial Court on 17.02.2023 and in compliance of the order passed by this Court, dated 23.10.2025, the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner has brought the Bank Draft bearing No.143311, dated 12.11.2025 for sum of Rs.3,75,000/- of the Canara Bank, Thanthoni Bank, Karur in favour of the respondent and handed over the original Bank Draft to the the learned Counsel for the Respondent before this Court. A copy of the Bank Draft has also been produced before this Court, which is taken on record and the learned Counsel for the Respondent hereby acknowledges receipt of the aforesaid amount. The learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner also submits that the petitioner in total has paid a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- to the respondent and no amount is due against the Revision Petitioner.

8.The learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner further submits that both the parties have entered into a Joint Memorandum of Compromise dated 13.11.2025 to the effect that the Criminal Revision



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

case shall be settled in accordance with the terms and conditions as contained therein.

9.Mr.V.S.Kumaraguru, learned counsel for the Respondent submits that the Respondent received the balance cheque amount to the tune of Rs.3,75,000/- by way of Bank Draft bearing No.143311, dated 12.11.2025 of the Canara Bank, Thanthoni Branch, Karur, and he submits that the entire amount has been paid by the Revision Petitioner and no amount is due against the Revision Petitioner.

10.Learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner further submits that the present Revision has been filed on 07.08.2025 before this Court and on the basis of change in circumstances, as the parties have entered into Memorandum of Compromise, it was prayed to this Court to compound the offence. It was further argued by the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner that this Court has inherent powers to compound the offence, so that, ends of justice could be secured as the object of Negotiable Instruments Act is primarily compensatory and not punitive and moreover Section 147 of NI Act would have an overriding effect on



Section 359 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

Irrespective of which stage, the parties are compromising with the kind leave of this Hon'ble Court.

11. In support of his arguments, learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner has submitted that in the case of ***Damodar S. Prabhu vs. Sayed Babalal H reported at 2010 (2) SCC (Cri) 1328***, the Hon'ble Apex Court had formulated the guidelines for compounding the offence under section 138 N.I. Act wherein in para 21, it was pleased to observe as under :

"With regard to the progression of litigation in cheque bouncing cases, the learned Attorney General has urged this Court to frame guidelines for a graded scheme of imposing costs on parties who unduly delay compounding of the offence. It was submitted that the requirement of deposit of the costs will act as a deterrent for delayed composition, since at present, free and easy compounding of offences at any stage, however belated, gives an incentive to the drawer of the cheque to delay settling the cases for years. An application for compounding made after several years not only results in the system being burdened but the



complainant is also deprived of effective justice. In view of this submission, we direct that the following guidelines be followed:- THE GUIDELINES (i) In the circumstances, it is proposed as follows:

(a) That directions can be given that the Writ of Summons be suitably modified making it clear to the accused that he could make an application for compounding of the offences at the first or second hearing of the case and that if such an application is made, compounding may be allowed by the court without imposing any costs on the accused. (b) If the accused does not make an application for compounding as aforesaid, then if an application for compounding is made before the Magistrate at a subsequent stage, compounding can be allowed subject to the condition that the accused will be required to pay 10% of the cheque amount to be deposited as a condition for compounding with the Legal Services Authority, or such authority as the Court deems fit.

(c) Similarly, if the application for compounding is made before the Sessions Court or a High Court in revision or appeal, such compounding may be allowed on the condition that the accused pays 15% of the cheque amount by way of costs.



(d) Finally, if the application for compounding is made before the Supreme Court, the figure would increase to 20% of the cheque amount."

12.Learned counsel for the Revision petitioner also submitted that in the case of ***M/s Meters and Instruments Private Limited and another vs. Kanchan Mehta reported at 2017 (7) Supreme 558***, the Hon'ble the Apex Court in para 18, was pleased to observe as under :

"i) Offence under Section 138 of the Act is primarily a civil wrong. Burden of proof is on accused in view presumption under Section 139 but the standard of such proof is "preponderance of probabilities". The same has to be normally tried summarily as per provisions of summary trial under the Cr.P.C. but with such variation as may be appropriate to proceedings under Chapter XVII of the Act. Thus read, principle of Section 258 Cr.P.C. will apply and the Court can close the proceedings and discharge the accused on satisfaction that the cheque amount with assessed costs and interest is paid and if there is no reason to proceed with the punitive aspect.

(ii)The object of the provision being primarily compensatory, punitive element being mainly with the object of enforcing the compensatory element,



compounding at the initial stage has to be encouraged but is not debarred at later stage subject to appropriate compensation as may be found acceptable to the parties or the Court.

(iii) Though compounding requires consent of both parties, even in absence of such consent, the Court, in the interests of justice, on being satisfied that the complainant has been duly compensated, can in its discretion close the proceedings and discharge the accused. (iv) Procedure for trial of cases under Chapter XVII of the Act has normally to be summary. The discretion of the Magistrate under second proviso to Section 143, to hold that it was undesirable to try the case summarily as sentence of more than one year may have to be passed, is to be exercised after considering the further fact that apart from the sentence of imprisonment, the Court has jurisdiction under Section 357(3) Cr.P.C. to award suitable compensation with default sentence under Section 64 IPC and with further powers of recovery under Section 431 Cr.P.C. With this approach, prison sentence of more than one year may not be required in all cases.

(v) Since evidence of the complaint can be given on affidavit, subject to the Court summoning the person giving affidavit and examining him and the bank's slip



being prima facie evidence of the dishonor of cheque, it is unnecessary for the Magistrate to record any further preliminary evidence. Such affidavit evidence can be read as evidence at all stages of trial or other proceedings. The manner of examination of the person giving affidavit can be as per Section 264 Cr.P.C. The scheme is to follow summary procedure except where exercise of power under second proviso to Section 143 becomes necessary, where sentence of one year may have to be awarded and compensation under Section 357(3) is considered inadequate, having regard to the amount of the cheque, the financial capacity and the conduct of the accused or any other circumstances'.

13. Learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner further has relied upon the judgment of ***Gujarat High Court in the case of Kripal Singh Pratap Singh Ori vs. Salvinder Kaur Hardip Singh*** reported in ***2004 Crl. L. J. 3786*** wherein, the Gujarat High Court was pleased to observe as under:-

“31. In the circumstances, it is hereby declared that the compromise arrived between the parties to this litigation out of court is accepted as genuine and the order of conviction and sentence passed by the learned



JMFC, Vadodara and confirmed in appeal by the learned Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court, Vadodara, therefore, on the given set of facts are hereby quashed and set aside as this court intends, otherwise to secure the ends of justice as provided under section 482 Cr.P.C. Obviously the order disposing Revision Application would not have any enforceable effect."

14. Learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner has also relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of ***Vinay Devanna Nayak vs. Ryot Seva Sahkari Bank Limited*** reported in ***AIR 2008 SC 716***, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court was pleased to observe as under :

"18. Taking into consideration even the said provision (Section 147) and the primary object underlying Section 138, in our judgment, there is no reason to refuse compromise between the parties. We, therefore, dispose of the appeal on the basis of the settlement arrived at between the appellant and the respondent.

19. For the foregoing reasons the appeal deserves to be allowed and is accordingly allowed by holding that since the matter has been compromised between the parties and the amount of Rs.45,000/- has been paid by



the appellant towards full and final settlement to the respondent-bank towards its dues, the appellant is entitled to acquittal. The order of conviction and sentence recorded by all courts is set aside and he is acquitted of the charge levelled against him."

15. Learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner has argued that the law regarding compounding of offences under the N.I. Act is very clear and is no more *res integra* and the offences under the N.I. Act can be compounded even at any stage of the proceedings. He submits that in terms of the aforesaid law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the parties may be permitted to compound the offence and the conviction of the petitioner be set aside.

16. Per contra, Mr.A.S.Abul Kalam Azad, learned Government Advocate who appeared for the State and assisted this Court in the matter, has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and submits that the Revision Petitioner has already been convicted by the learned trial court and the



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

conviction order had already been upheld by the Appellate Court in the appeal.

17. The learned Government Advocate further submitted that the appeal has been rejected on merit and the Revision Petitioner was convicted, then where the parties or any one of them can be permitted to place compromise and to get the order of acquittal from the Court is the question. He further submitted that the present case is nothing, but a gross misuse of the process of law and thus sentence cannot be compounded on the basis of compromise as filed by the parties.

18. Learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner submits that this Court has already decided a similar issue vide judgment and order dated **19.09.2025 in Crl.R.C.(MD)No.875 of 2025 [K.Balachenniappan Vs Jeyakrishnan]**. The counsel argues that the present revision petitioner's case is fully covered by the aforesaid judgment and prays that the present Revision Petition may be disposed of in the same terms. A copy of the judgment has been placed before the Court for perusal.



19. I have heard the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner, learned counsel for the Respondent and learned Government Advocate appearing for the State and perused the materials placed on record.

20. Considering the facts as narrated above, the following question arose for consideration.

'Whether the order passed by the Appellate Court confirming the conviction of the trial court under section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act can be nullified by the High Court on the basis of compromise entered between the parties'.

21. Before answering the aforesaid question as framed, I shall examine the relevant provision of the B.N.S.S., as well as the Negotiable Instrument Act. I may extract Section 359 of B.N.S.S., and Section 147 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

Section 359 B.N.S.S. - Compounding of Offences -

1) The offences punishable under the sections of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 specified in the first two columns of the Table next following may be



compounded by the persons mentioned in the third column of that Table: -

2)The offences punishable under the sections of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 specified in the first two columns of the Table next following may, with the permission of the Court before which any prosecution for such offence is pending, be compounded by the persons mentioned in the third column of that Table:--

3) When an offence is compoundable under this section, the abetment of such offence or an attempt to commit such offence (when such attempt is itself an offence) or where the accused is liable under sub-section (5) of section 3 or section 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (45 of 2023), may be compounded in like manner.

(4)(a) When the person who would otherwise be competent to compound an offence under this section is a child or of unsound mind, any person competent to



contract on his behalf may, with the permission of the Court, compound such offence;

(b) When the person who would otherwise be competent to compound an offence under this section is dead, the legal representative, as defined in the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (5 of 1908) of such person may, with the consent of the Court, compound such offence.

(5) When the accused has been committed for trial or when he has been convicted and an appeal is pending, no composition for the offence shall be allowed without the leave of the Court to which he is committed, or, as the case may be, before which the appeal is to be heard.

(6) A High Court or Court of Session acting in the exercise of its powers of revision under section 442 may allow any person to compound any offence which such person is competent to compound under this section.

(7) No offence shall be compounded if the accused is, by reason of a previous conviction, liable either to



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

enhanced punishment or to a punishment of a different kind for such offence.

(8) The composition of an offence under this section shall have the effect of an acquittal of the accused with whom the offence has been compounded.

(9) No offence shall be compounded except as provided by this section.

Section 147 of the Negotiable Instrument Act:-

Offences to be compoundable.—Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), every offence punishable under this Act shall be compoundable.

22. It is well settled that inherent power of the Court can be exercised only when no other remedy is available to the litigants and nor a specific remedy as provided by the statute. It is also well settled that if an effective, alternative remedy is available, the High Court will not exercise its inherent power, especially when the Revision Petitioner may not have availed of that remedy. The power can be exercised by the High



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

Court to secure the ends of justice, prevent abuse of the process of any court and to make such orders as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Sanhita or Act, depending upon the facts of the given case. This Court can always take note of any miscarriage of justice and prevent the same by exercising its power. These powers are neither limited, nor curtailed by any other provision of the Sanhita or Act. However, such inherent powers are to be exercised sparingly and with caution.

23. In the instant case, it is true that the appeal was dismissed and the conviction and sentence was upheld by the appellate court, but it cannot be lost sight of the fact that this Court has power to intervene in exercise of its power only with a view to do the substantial justice or to avoid a miscarriage and the spirit of compromise arrived at between the parties. This is perfectly justified and legal too.

24. I have considered the judgments cited by the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner as well as by the learned Counsel for the State and other decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court and I do not think it



necessary to enlist those decisions which are taken into consideration for the purpose of the present proceedings.

25. In the instant case, the Revision Petitioner is invoking the inherent power of this court after dismissal of the appeal confirming his conviction and sentence. In these circumstances, I have to examine as to whether for entertaining the aforesaid case, any special circumstances are made out or not, so it can be legitimately argued and inferred and held that in all cases where the Revision Petitioner is able to satisfy this Court that there are special circumstances which can be clearly spelt out subsequent proceeding invoking inherent power of this court can be modified and cannot be thrown away on that technical argument as to its sustainability once the contesting parties entered into subsequent compromise.

26. In view of the decisions rendered in the judgment dated **19.09.2025 in Crl.R.C.(MD)No.875 of 2025 [K.Balachenniappan Vs Jeyakrishnan]** and taking into account the fact that the parties have



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

settled the dispute amicably by way of compromise, this Court is of the view that the compounding of the offence as required to be permitted.

27. Accordingly, the present Criminal Revision Case is **disposed of** in terms of Memorandum of Compromise arrived at between the parties to this litigation out of Court. The impugned judgment passed by the learned Principal District Judge, Karur, in C.A.No.12 of 2023, dated 24.07.2024, partly confirming the judgment passed by the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, in STC.No. 10 of 2021, dated 06.10.2022, are hereby **modified**. The conviction and sentence under [Section 138](#) of the Negotiable Instruments Act in STC.No.10 of 2021, dated 06.10.2022 **stands annulled** as this Court intends, otherwise to secure the ends of justice. The Revision Petitioner shall be treated as **acquitted** on account of compounding of the offence with the complainant/person affected.

28. **In the result,**

- The Criminal Revision Case is **disposed of** in terms of Joint Memorandum of Compromise dated 13.11.2025.



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

WEB COPY

- The judgment passed by the learned Principal District Judge, Karur, in C.A.No.12 of 2023 dated 24.07.2024, partly confirming the judgment passed by the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, in STC.No.10 of 2021, dated 06.10.2022 are hereby **modified**.
- The conviction and sentence imposed on the Revision Petitioner by both the courts below **stands annulled**.
- The Revision Petitioner shall be treated as **acquitted** on account of compounding of the offence with the complainant/respondent.

There is no order as to costs.

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

13.11.2025

mm



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram.
- 2.The Principal District Judge, Karur.



WEB COPY



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

SHAMIM AHMED, J.

mm

CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1033 of 2025

13.11.2025

30/30