



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: **24.11.2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED**

CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1031 of 2023

S.Vijayalakshmi
W/o. Rathina Kumar
No.10E
Ramakrishnapuram West
Karur District.

... Petitioner

vs.

P.Palanisamy
S/o. Pitchaimuthu, No.131A
Veeraakkiyam R.S.
Balarajapuram Village and Post
Krishnarayapuram Taluk
Karur District.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Petition is filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records and to set aside the conviction and sentence imposed by judgment dated 18.8.2023 in CA.No.111 of 2022 on the file of learned Principal District Judge, Karur District by partly allowed the Judgment rendered by the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram by its judgment dated 13.09.2022 in STC.No.58 of 2021.



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Arul Jenifer
For Respondent : Mr.R.Gunasekaran

ORDER

Heard Mr.A.Arul Jenifer, learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner and Mr.R.Gunasekaran, 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 learned Principal District Judge, Karur District in C.A.No.111 of 2022, dated 18.08.2023, confirming the conviction and sentence imposed in STC.No.58 of 2021, dated 13.09.2022 on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram.

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:-



Cr.L.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

a) The Petitioner was convicted and sentenced for the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act in STC.No.58 of 2021, vide judgment dated 13.09.2022, on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, to undergo 12 months imprisonment for the offence alleged under Section 138 of Negotiable Instrument Act and to pay a sum of Rs.7,60,000/- towards compensation, to the respondent, in default, to undergo three month imprisonment and to pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- towards fine, in default, to undergo three months imprisonment. Aggrieved by the order of the Trial Court, the Petitioner had filed a Criminal Appeal in C.A.No.111 of 2022 before the learned Principal District Judge, Karur District.

b) The learned Principal District Judge, Karur District, by confirming the conviction and sentence, however, by modifying the compensation amount from Rs.7,60,000/- to Rs.3,80,000/- of the judgment of the trial Court, dated 13.09.2022 in STC.No.58 of 2021, had partly allowed the appeal. Aggrieved by the same, the present Criminal Revision Petition has been filed.



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

WEB COPY

4.This Court, vide order dated 05.11.2025, had passed the following order:

“The present Criminal Revision Case has been filed with the following prayer:

“to call for the records and to set aside the conviction and sentence imposed by judgment dated 18.08.2023 in CA.No. 111 of 2022 on the file of learned Principal District Judge, Karur District by partly allowed the Judgment rendered by the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram by its judgment, dated 13.09.2022 in S.T.C.No.58 of 2021 by allowing this Revision Petition.”

2.Heard Mr.M.Anbarasan, learned Counsel for the petitioner and Mr.R.Gunasekaran, learned Counsel for the respondent.

3.The Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, while admitting the Criminal Revision Case, vide order, dated 15.09.2023, had ordered suspension of sentence in Crl.M.P(MD)No.13282 of 2023 in Crl.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023, with the following directions:-

“6.Accordingly, this petition is allowed and the



substantive sentence of imprisonment alone is suspended pending disposal of the revision with the following directions:-

(i) The petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- of the compensation amount to the credit of S.T.C.No.58 of 2021, on the file of the learned District Munsif cum-Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, failing which the sentence suspended shall automatically dismissed and the respondent is at liberty to execute the sentence imposed by the trial Court against the petitioner in the manner known to law;

ii) On such deposit, the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the District Court, Karur;

(iii) The sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the trial Court may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity; and

(iv) The petitioner shall appear before the trial Court once in a month i.e., on the first working day of every English calendar month at 10.30 a.m., until further orders. (v) The learned trial Judge is hereby directed to deposit the said amount in any one of the Nationalized Bank in interest bearing account."

*4.Today, when the matter is being taken up,
Mr.M.Anbarasan, learned Counsel for the Revision*



Petitioner submits that in compliance of the order passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, dated 15.09.2023, in CrL.M.P(MD)No.13282 of 2023 in CrL.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023, the Revision Petitioner has already deposited a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- to the credit of S.T.C.No.58 of 2021 on the file of the District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayampuram.

5.The learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner further submits that the Revision Petitioner has already deposited a sum of Rs.1,90,000/-, before the trial Court. He further submits that in total, the Revision Petitioner has deposited a sum of Rs. 2,90,000/- out of the compensation amount of Rs. 3,80,000/-, as directed by the lower Appellate Court and only a sum of Rs.90,000/- remains to be paid by the Revision Petitioner to the respondent. He also submits that he will pursue the Revision Petitioner to pay the balance amount of Rs.90,000/- and also try to settle the matter amicably and undertakes to file a compromise affidavit on or before the next date fixed. Thus, he submits that the matter may be finally decided on the basis of compromise and this Court by exercising



power under Section 147 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, may compound the offence.

6.Mr.R.Gunasekaran, learned Counsel for the respondent also acknowledges the deposit of Rs. 1,90,000/- and Rs.1,00,000/- by the Revision Petitioner. He also submits that if the remaining amount of Rs. 90,000/- is paid by the Revision Petitioner, the respondent has no objection to compromise the matter with the Revision Petitioner and this Court by exercising power under Section 147 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, may compound the offence. The learned Counsel for the respondent further submits that the respondent may be permitted to withdraw the entire amount of Rs.2,90,000/- (Rs.1,90,000/- + Rs.1,00,000/-) deposited by the Revision Petitioner before the trial Court on various occasions.

7.Accordingly, after considering the arguments as advanced by the learned Counsel for the parties, this Court grants two weeks time to the Revision Petitioner to pay the remaining amount of Rs.90,000/- (Rupees Ninety Thousand only) in favour of the Respondent by way of demand draft and shall produce the same on the next date fixed. In this regard, learned Counsel for the



Revision Petitioner as well as the Respondent are directed to file a joint memo of compromise and the Revision Petitioner as well as the respondent are directed to appear before this Court in person on the next date fixed.

8. The respondent is permitted to file an application before the trial Court for withdrawal of amount deposited by the Revision Petition, ie., a sum of Rs.2,90,000/- (Rs.1,90,000/- + Rs.1,00,000/-) before the trial Court, within ten days from today and if any such application is filed by the respondent within the time stipulated by this Court, the trial Court is directed to disburse the amount to the respondent within a period of ten days thereafter.

9.Put up this case “for orders” on 24.11.2025 before this Court.”

5.In compliance of the order passed by this Court, dated 05.11.2025 in the present Criminal Revision Case, the parties have entered into a Memorandum of Compromise dated 24.11.2025 through their counsel, which is taken on record and as per the terms of the



Cr.L.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

compromise, the following conditions were laid down between the parties, which are quoted as under:-

“5.It is submitted that during the pendency of above criminal revision, the revision petitioner and respondent have arrived at a compromise on following terms:-

a.The revision petitioner has paid remaining cheque amount of Rs. 90,000/- by way of Demand Draft drawn at KVB in D.D.No. 684439 dated 17.11.2025 in favour of the respondent as directed by this Hon'ble Court.

b. The respondent/complainant is hereby reporting no objection for acquitting the revision petitioner in S.T.C.No. 58 of 2021 by allowing this criminal revision.

c. The respondent/complainant also agrees to withdraw the suit filed against the revision petitioner on the basis of pro note in O.S.No. 175 of 2023 on the file of the Learned Principal District Judge, Karur.

d. The revision petitioner agrees to pay another sum of Rs.70,000/- in hand to the



respondent/complainant towards the liability in O.S.No. 175 of 2023.

e. The revision petitioner has no objection for withdrawing the amount of Rs.2,90,000/- already deposited in S.T.C.No. 58 of 2021 on the file of District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapam, Karur District.

6. It is submitted that, the above terms of compromise have been arrived between the parties as a full and final settlement between them in respect of cheque no 168617 and 168618 drawn at Syndicate bank Krur Branch and other cheques available with respondent pretend to be issued by the revision petitioner and the pro note in respect of which suit has been filed in O.S.No. 175 of 2023 pending on the file of Learned Principal District Judge, Karur.

Therefore, it is just and necessary that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept the MEMO OF COMPROMISE and acquit the revision petitioner by allowing this Criminal Revision Petition and thus render justice.”



CrI.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

6.The learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 05.11.2025 passed by this Court, both the parties have entered into a Joint Memorandum of Compromise dated 24.11.2025 through their counsel 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.3,80,000/-, as per the judgment made in C.A.No.111 of 2022, dated 18.08.2023, on the file of the Principal District Judge, Karur District, the Petitioner has already deposited a sum of Rs.2,90,000/- before the trial Court on various occasions. It was further submitted that in compliance of the order passed by this Court, dated 05.11.2025, the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner has brought the Bank Draft bearing No.684439, dated 17.11.2025 for sum of Rs.90,000/- of the Karur Vyasya Bank, Karur West (L.N.S.) Branch, in favour of the respondent and handed over the



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

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.3,80,000/- to the respondent, as directed by the first appellate Court 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 24.11.2025 through their counsel to the effect that the Criminal Revision case shall be settled in accordance with the terms and conditions as contained therein.

9.Mr.R.Gunasekaran, learned counsel for the Respondent submits that the Respondent received the balance compensation amount to the



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

tune of Rs.90,000/- by way of Bank Draft bearing No.684439, dated 17.11.2025 for sum of Rs.90,000/- of the Karur Vyasya Bank, Karur West (L.N.S.) Branch 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 as well as the Respondent submit that in view of the joint compromise entered into between the parties, this Court by exercising power under Section 147 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, may compound the offence and the present Criminal Revision Petition may be disposed of accordingly.

11.Learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner further submits that the present Revision has been filed on 12.09.2023 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



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

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.

12.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."

13.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'.

14. 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.”



WEB COPY

15. 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.”



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

WEB COPY

16. 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.

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



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

18. 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.

19. 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.



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

20. 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.

21. 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'.

22. 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 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.

(10)



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

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.

23. 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 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



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

limited, nor curtailed by any other provision of the Sanhita or Act.

However, such inherent powers are to be exercised sparingly and with caution.

24. In the instant case, it is true that the appeal was partly allowed 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.

25. 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.



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

26. 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.

27. 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 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.



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

WEB COPY 28. 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 District in C.A.No.111 of 2022, dated 18.08.2023, confirming the conviction and sentence imposed in STC.No.58 of 2021, dated 13.09.2022 on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, are hereby **modified**. The conviction and sentence under [Section 138](#) of the Negotiable Instruments Act in STC.No.58 of 2021, dated 13.09.2022, **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.

29. In the result,

- The Criminal Revision Case is **disposed of** in terms of Joint Memorandum of Compromise dated 24.11.2025.



CrL.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

WEB COPY

- The judgment passed by the learned Principal District Judge, Karur District in C.A.No.111 of 2022, dated 18.08.2023, confirming the conviction and sentence imposed in STC.No.58 of 2021, dated 13.09.2022 on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram, 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.

30.The Respondent is also permitted to file an application before the trial Court for withdrawal of Rs.2,90,000/-, if already not withdrawn, which was already deposited by the Revision Petitioner on various occasions and if any such application is filed by the Respondent, the Trial Court is directed to disburse the said amount to the respondent within a period of ten days from the date of filing of such application.



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

WEB COPY There is no order as to costs.

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

24.11.2025

To

1.The Principal District Judge, Karur District .

2.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Krishnarayapuram.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

SHAMIM AHMED, J.

mm

Order made in
Crl.R.C(MD)No.1031 of 2023

24.11.2025