



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16121 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 24.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.O.P.(MD).No.16121 of 2025

1. Pushparaj @ Pushbaraj
2. Muthukumar
3. Janagiraman @ Janakiraman ... Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Represented by the Inspector of Police,
Nagudi Police Station,
Pudukkottai.
(Crime No. 156/2024) ...1st Respondent / Complainant
2. Neelavathy ... 2nd Respondent/ Defacto
Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records relating to the charge sheet in S.C.No.158 of 2025 on the file of the Mahila Court, Pudukkottai and quash the same as the matter is amicably settled between parties.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Ragul
For R1 : Mr.R.Meenakshi Sundaram
Additional Public Prosecutor
For R2 : Mr.Udhaya Jeeva



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16121 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioners seek to quash the final report in S.C.No.158 of 2025 on the file of the Mahila Court, Pudukkottai, which was filed for the offences under Sections 366, 354, 294(b), 323, 324 of IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act.

2. The allegation in the final report is that the petitioners, who are the brother and close relatives of the husband of the defacto complainant; that they kidnapped the defacto complainant in a car and abused her in filthy language and caused hurt to her and thus, committed the aforesaid offences.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the dispute is primarily stems out of a matrimonial issue between the second respondent and her husband; that the petitioners are close relatives of the second respondent's husband; and that the parties have now entered into a compromise and decided to give a quietus to the entire dispute.

4. The parties have filed a joint compromise memo dated 24th September 2025 and the scanned copy of the compromise memo reads as follows:



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16121 of 2025

WEB COPY

MEMORANDUM OF CRIMINAL ORIGINAL PETITION
(Under Section 528 of Cr.P.C)
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF MADRAS
AT MADURAI BENCH

Crl.O.P.(MD).No. [612] of 2025

Against

S.C. No.158 of 2025

(On the file of the Mahila Court, Pudukkottai)

- 1) Pushparaj @ Pushbaraj (aged about 39 years)
S/o. Ramaya @ Ramaiya,
No.2/117, V.O.C Nagar,
Arasarkulam, Keelapathi
Pudukkottai.
- 2) Muthukumar (aged about 45 years)
S/o. Marimuthu,
No.59, Vadakku Manamelkudi,
Manamelkudi Taluk,
Pudukkottai.
- 3) Janagiraman @ Janakiraman (aged about 41 years)
S/o. Kasinathan,
No.1/50B, Vadakku Manamelkudi,
Manamelkudi Taluk,
Pudukkottai.

... Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3
Vs.

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

Petitioners
/Accused No.1 to 3

Counsel for Petitioners

2nd Respondent
/Defacto Complainant

Counsel for 2nd Respondent



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16121 of 2025

WEB COPY

- 1) The State of Tamil Nadu rep., by
The Inspector of Police,
Nagudi Police Station,
Pudukkottai.
(Crime No.156 of 2024) ... 1st Respondent/Complainant
- 2) Neelavathy (aged about 42 years)
W/o. Ramachanthiran,
No.59, Vadakku Manamelkudi,
Manamelkudi Taluk,
Pudukkottai. ... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

JOINT MEMO OF COMPROMISE

1) It is respectfully submitted that at the instance of the 2nd respondent herein, the 1st respondent police had registered a case in Crime No. 156 of 2024 for the offences punishable under sections 366, 354, 294(b), 323, 324 of IPC and section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act against the petitioners. On completion of investigation the case was charge sheeted and taken on file in S.C.No.158 of 2025 on file of Mahila Court, Pudukkottai for the offences punishable under sections 366, 354, 294(b), 323, 324 of IPC and section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act against the petitioners.

- 1) *[Signature]*
- 2) *[Signature]*
- 3) *[Signature]*

**Petitioners
/Accused No.1 to 3**

[Signature]
Counsel for Petitioners

[Signature]
**2nd Respondent
/Defacto Complainant**

[Signature]
Counsel for 2nd Respondent



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16121 of 2025

WEB COPY

2) It is respectfully submitted that the pending trial, the defacto complainant as well as the petitioners have amicably resolved their differences and settled the entire dispute between them. Since both are relatives parties entered into amicable settlement

3) It is respectfully submitted that the defacto complainant has now realized that she had given the above complaint when she was emotional and the same lead him to exaggerate, further the defacto complainant is not interested in prosecuting the petitioners. The very proceedings pending as against the petitioners would not yield any result since the petitioners as well as the defacto complainant entered into a compromise. The pendency of the criminal case will be in no use, since both parties entered into compromise and in order to avoid the delay of time, the petitioners advised to file this petition. The Joint memo of compromise may be treated as part and parcel of this petition. Hence, in view of the amicable settlement between parties the case pending in S.C. No. 158 of 2025 on the file of the Mahila Court, Pudukkottai may be quashed. Hence, the petitioners and the 2nd respondent have jointly filed this Memo of Compromise.

1) *Alm. Y. J. J.*
2) *M. P. J. J.*
3) *Samy - K*
Petitioners
/Accused No.1 to 3

R. D.
Counsel for Petitioners

R. S. S.
2nd Respondent
/Defacto Complainant

R.
Counsel for 2nd Respondent



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16121 of 2025

WEB COPY

It is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to accept the Joint Compromise Memo and allow the above Crl.O.P.(MD)No. of 2025 on the file of this Hon'ble Court as the matter is amicably settled between parties and thus render justice.

Dated at Madurai this the 23rd day of September, 2025.

- 1) *Sh. Y. S. S.*
- 2) *Sh. S. S. S.*
- 3) *Sh. S. S.*

**Petitioners
/Accused No.1 to 3**

P. S. S.
Counsel for Petitioners

R. S. S.
**2nd Respondent
/Defacto Complainant**

S. S. S.
Counsel for 2nd Respondent



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16121 of 2025

5. The petitioners and the second respondent are present before this Court in person and are identified by Mr.G.Babu, Special Sub Inspector of Police, Nagudi Police Station, Pudukkottai District. The second respondent confirms the compromise and states that she has no objection for quashing the sessions case.

6. Considering the relationship of the parties and also considering the fact that now the second respondent is happily living with her husband and the dispute is private in nature, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be served in keeping the impugned final report pending trial. Accordingly, the impugned final report in S.C.No.158 of 2025 on the file of the Mahila Court, Pudukkottai, is quashed and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The petitioners shall pay a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) as costs to the High Court Legal Services Authority attached to this Bench forthwith and file a photocopy of the receipt along with a memo reporting compliance in the Registry.

24.09.2025

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16121 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Nagudi Police Station,
Pudukkottai.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16121 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Indu

Crl.O.P(MD).No.16121 of 2025

24.09.2025