

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2025

Ramachandran

... Petitioner

Vs


1.The State of Tamilnadu, Rep.,
By its the Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Oddanchatram,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.17/2024).

2.Chellamal
W/o.T.Samuel,
Rural Welfare Officer,
Reddiyarchatram,
Dindigul.

3. Xxxxx,,
D/o.Xxxxx,
XXXXXXXXXX,
XXXXXXXXXX,
Dindigul District.

... Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 BNSS, to call for the records pertaining to the Charge Sheet in Spl.Sc.145 of 2024, on the file of the Fast Track Mahila Court, Dindigul in Crime No.17 of



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2024

WEB COPY

2024 on the file of the respondent No.1 and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner	: Mr.R.Venkatesan
For R1	: Mr.A.S.Abul Kalaam, Azad, Government Advocate(Crl.side)
For R2	:Mr. V.Dharmaraj

ORDER

The petitioner is the sole accused in Spl.S.C.No.145 of 2024 for the offence under Sections 5(1), 5(j)(ii) r/w 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 and Section 9 of Child Marriage Act, 2006, pending on the file of the Fast Track Mahila Court, Dindigul. He has filed this application to quash the proceedings pending against him, on the ground that the issue has been amicably settled among themselves.

2.The prosecution case is that the petitioner and the victim girl are close relative. They had love affair with each other, they have married and thereafter, the victim girl got pregnant. Therefore, on the complaint of the Social Welfare Officer, a case in Cr.No.17 of 2024 has been registered and upon completion of investigation, final report has also been filed as against this petitioner.




CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2024

WEB COPY

3.The case has been registered for the offence under Section 5(1), 5(j)(ii) r/w 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 and Section 9 of Child Marriage Act, 2006, which are non-compoundable offences. However, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Parbathbhai Aahir @ Parbathbhai Vs. State of Gujrath*** [2017 9 SCC 641] and in ***The State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Dhruv Gurjar and Another*** [(2019) 2 MLJ CrI 10], has given sufficient guidelines that must be taken into consideration by the Court while exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C,(528 BNSS) to quash non-compoundable offences. One very important test that has been laid down is that the Court must necessarily examine whether the crime in question is purely individual in nature or a crime against the society with overriding public interest. It has been repeatedly cautioned that offences against the society with overriding public interest even if it gets settled between the parties, cannot be quashed by this Court.

4.Though this Court is not inclined to entertain this petition at the first instance, a similar issue has been dealt by this Court in ***Vijayalakshmi and Ors Vs State and Ors reported in (2021) 2 CTC 191***,



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2024

as follows:-

WEB COPY

17.This Court is not turning a blind eye to cases where the victim or survivor may, under the effect of trauma that they have undergone, studies on which show that they might tend to reconcile with the same by blaming themselves or convincing themselves that the element of consent was infact present. Nor is this Court scientifically justifying in toto, the genuineness or predicament of the accused in every case where it appears that the accused and victim child have been in a romantic relationship. That will depend on the facts and circumstances of each and every case.

18.In the present case, the 2nd Petitioner who was in a relationship with the 2nd Respondent who is also in his early twenties, has clearly stated that she was the one who insisted that the 2nd Respondent take her away from her home and marry her, due to the pressure exerted by her parents. The 2nd Respondent, who was placed in a very precarious situation decided to concede to the demand of the 2nd Petitioner. Thereafter, they eloped from their respective homes, got married and consummated the marriage. Incidents of this nature keep occurring regularly even now in villages and towns and occasionally in cities. After the parents or family lodge a complaint, the police register FIRs for offences of kidnapping and various offences under the POCSO Act. Several criminal cases booked under the POCSO Act fall under this category. As a consequence of such a FIR being registered, invariably the boy gets arrested and thereafter, his youthful life comes to a grinding halt. The provisions of the POCSO Act, as it stands today, will surely make the acts of the boy an offence due to its stringent nature. An adolescent boy caught in a situation like this



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2024

WEB COPY

will surely have no defense if the criminal case is taken to its logical end. Punishing an adolescent boy who enters into a relationship with a minor girl by treating him as an offender, was never the objective of the POCSO Act. An adolescent boy and girl who are in the grips of their hormones and biological changes and whose decision-making ability is yet to fully develop, should essentially receive the support and guidance of their parents and the society at large. These incidents should never be perceived from an adult's point of view and such an understanding will in fact lead to lack of empathy. An adolescent boy who is sent to prison in a case of this nature will be persecuted throughout his life. It is high time that the legislature takes into consideration cases of this nature involving adolescents involved in relationships and swiftly bring in necessary amendments under the Act. The legislature has to keep pace with the changing societal needs and bring about necessary changes in law and more particularly in a stringent law such as the POCSO Act.

19. The main issue that requires the consideration of this Court is as to whether this Court can quash the criminal proceedings involving noncompoundable offences pending against the second respondent. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Parbathbhai Aahir @ Parbathbhai Vs. State of Gujraath, reported in 2017 9 SCC 641 and in case of The State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Dhruv Gurjar and Another reported in (2019) 2 MLJ CrI 10, has given sufficient guidelines that must be taken into consideration by this Court while exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, to quash non-compoundable offences. One very important test that has been laid down is that the Court must necessarily examine if the crime in question is purely individual in nature or a



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2024


WEB COPY

crime against the society with overriding public interest. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that offences against the society with overriding public interest even if it gets settled between the parties, cannot be quashed by this Court.

20. In the present case, the offences in question are purely individual/personal in nature. It involves the 2nd Petitioner and the 2nd Respondent and their respective families only. It involves the future of two young persons who are still in their early twenties. The second respondent is working as an Auto driver to eke his livelihood. Quashing the proceedings, will not affect any overriding public interest in this case and it will in fact pave way for the 2nd Petitioner and the 2nd Respondent to settle down in their life and look for better future prospects. No useful purpose will be served in continuing with the criminal proceedings and keeping these proceedings pending will only swell the mental agony of the victim girl and her mother and not to forget the 2nd Respondent as well.

5. Therefore, this Court entertained this petition, ordered notice and also directed the investigation officer to ascertain as to whether the compromise arrived between the parties is a voluntary one, without any threat or coercion.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the victim girl has attained the age of major and they are living



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2024

WEB COPY

together along with their child. The victim girl, who is present before this Court submits that now she is living with her husband peacefully and therefore, she is not inclined to prosecute the case.

7.The learned Government Advocate(Crl.side) appearing for the first respondent also confirms that the marriage between the petitioner and the victim is a love marriage and it is not performed under any threat or coercion. He also confirms that the victim is having a child and living with the petitioner.

8.The object of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, is to ensure that the minor children are not subjected to marriage and their future should not be affected. No doubt a case has been registered when the victim child was admitted in the Government Hospital for delivery. The victim has stated that their marriage is a love marriage without knowing the consequences and it is not on compulsion. Now, they have also filed a joint compromise memo dated 30.06.2025.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2024

WEB COPY

9.The investigation officer, after verification, has filed a report that the compromise arrived upon between the parties is genuine, without any threat or coercion.

10.This Court has verified the parties with their Aadhar Cards and also verified as to the present status. The parties have expressed their willingness to solve the issue. The third respondent herself has submitted that she does not want to prosecute the case any further. Under such circumstances, no useful purpose will be served in keeping the case pending, even though the offences involved are not compoundable in nature. On the other hand, keeping the proceedings pending will only swell the mental agony of the parties.

11.In view of the above position and following the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases referred supra, this Court is inclined to quash the proceedings, though certain offences are non-compoundable, in order to avoid further conflict between the parties.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2024

WEB COPY

12. Accordingly, this original petition is allowed and the proceedings in Spl.Sc.145 of 2024, on the file of the Fast Track Mahila Court, Dindigul is hereby quashed. The joint compromise memo dated 30.06.2025 signed by the parties, shall form part and parcel of this order.

08.08.2025

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

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Oddanchatram,
Dindigul District.
2. The Fast Track Mahila Court, Dindigul
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2024

B.PUGALENDHI,J

vrn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12698 of 2025

08.08.2025