



**Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16077 of 2025**

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

WEB COPY

**DATED : 23.09.2025**

**CORAM**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN**

**Crl.O.P.(MD).No.16077 of 2025**

1.Sridhar @ Sridharan

2.Sivakumar

3.Tamilnesan

... Petitioners/Accused 1 to 3

**Vs.**

1.The State rep. by,  
The Inspector of Police,  
District Crime Branch,  
Dindigul District.  
(Crime No.6/2020)

... 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent/Complainant

2.S.Ravichandran

... 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent/Defacto Complainant

**Prayer:** Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to pass an order of quash, to call for the entire records in relating to the impugned Charge sheet in C.C.No.49 of 2021 before the Learned Judicial Magistrate Court No.II, Dindigul and to quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Vivek Bharathi

For R-1 : Mr.R.Meenakshi Sundaram  
Additional Public Prosecutor

For R-2 : Mr.K.Dhinesh Kumar



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16077 of 2025*

## **ORDER**

WEB COPY

The petitioners seek to quash the final report in C.C.No.49 of 2021 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul, which was filed for the offences under Section 120B, 406, 506(1), 384, 511, 465 and 471 of IPC.

2. The allegation in the final report is that the defacto complainant is the partner of Top Anil Marketing Company, who is doing “semia” (noodles) business; that on account of prior dispute, the first accused conspired with the other accused and videographed the poor quality of making “semia” as if the same is done in the defacto complainant's factory; that they demanded a sum of Rs.50,00,000 from the defacto complainant for not sharing the said video and thus committed the aforesaid offences.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners and the defacto complainant would submit that the proceedings arose on account of dispute between the petitioners and the defacto complainant in their business and that the parties have now arrived at a compromise.

4. The parties have filed a joint compromise memo dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2025 and the scanned copy of the compromise memo reads as follows:



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16077 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS  
MADURAI BENCH  
[Criminal Original Jurisdiction]

Crl.O.P[MD]No. of 2025

In

C.C. No. 49 of 2021

[on the file of the Learned Judicial Magistrate Court No.II, Dindigul]

@ SRIDHAR

1. SRIDHAR, [M/53 years]  
S/o. Perumal,  
No.2/8-A, Vellapommanpatti,  
Velvarkottai,  
Vedasandur Taluk,  
Dindugal District.

2. SIVAKUMAR (M/41 Years)  
S/o. Srirangan,  
Ooralipatti,  
Thummalakundu Post,  
Vedasandur Taluk,  
Dindugal District.

3. TAMILNESAN (M/50 Years)  
S/o. Rengasamy,  
No.560, MIC, Neidal,  
New Housing Board,  
Thanjavur-5

... Petitioners/Accused No.1 to 3

-Vs-

1. The State, Represented by,  
The Inspector of Police,  
District Crime Branch,  
Dindugal District.  
[Crime no. 6 of 2020]

... 1<sup>st</sup> respondent/Complainant

2. S.RAVICHANDRAN, [M/57 years]  
S/o. M.Sundaram, (Partner) Top Anil Marketing Company,  
A-11/1, L.G.B Compound, 3<sup>rd</sup> Street,  
Mengles Road,  
Dindugal District.

...2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent /Defacto-complainant.

**JOINT COMPROMISE MEMO**

1. It is most respectfully submitted that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent police registered a FIR in crime no. 6 of 2020 as against the petitioners for the alleged offences U/s. 120 (b), 406, 499, 506 (i), 384 and 511 of IPC, Sec 174 of Information Technology Act 2000 based on the complaint given by

*S. Sivan*  
S. Sivan

*S. Sivan*  
28/9/25



WEB COPY



**Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16077 of 2025**

the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent. Thereafter vide alteration report dated 12.06.2020 the sections were altered into 120 (b), 406, 506 (i), 384, 511, 465 and 471 of IPC. After completion of investigation, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent filed charge sheet in C.C.No. 49 of 2021 before the Learned Judicial Magistrate Court No.II, Dindigul for the alleged offences u/s. 120 (b), 406, 506 (i), 384, 511, 465 and 471 of IPC. The above criminal is pending adjudication before the above mentioned trial court.

3. It is most respectfully submitted that the alleged case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is partner of Top Anil Marketing Company, and who is running Semia business. Meanwhile on 13.03.2020 the 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner contacted the defacto complainant and asked ransom for not sharing of the video which contains that poor quality of making Semia at defacto complainant's factory. And he got the video from petitioners 1 and 2. Hence the complaint was registered by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent police in crime no. 6 of 2020 on 23.04.2020. Pursuant to the registration of the FIR, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent Police conducted investigation and laid charge sheet before the learned trial court in C.C.No. 49 of 2021 before the Learned Judicial Magistrate Court No.II, Dindigul District.

3. It is most respectfully submitted that the above criminal case is pending adjudication before the trial court in the stage of the Trial. During the pendency of the above proceedings, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and the petitioners entered into a compromise and the dispute was amicably settled between them. Therefore, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent does not want to proceed with the above mentioned criminal case as against the petitioners. Therefore, it is just and necessary to quash the impugned proceedings of the charge sheet in C.C.No. 49 of 2021 before the Learned Judicial Magistrate Court No.II, Dindigul.

4. To that effect of compromise between the petitioners and the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, the present joint compromise memo is filed before this Hon'ble High Court.

S. Srinivas  
S. Srinivas  
f

S. Srinivas  
23/4/24



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16077 of 2025

WEB COPY

Therefore it is prayed that this Hon'ble High Court may be pleased to accept this Joint Compromise memo and thus render justice.

Dated at Madurai on this 13<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2025.

*S. Ravichandran*  
23/9/25

2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT

S. RAVI CHANDRAN.

*S. Srinivasan*  
3. Sivakumar  
D. Srinivasan


PETITIONERS

COUNSEL FOR 2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT

*K. Dhinesh Kumar*  
D/6989/2020  
K. DHINESH KUMAR  
Ph: 8122477894  
2017-2020 Batch  
C.L.C., Delhi University  
New Delhi

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONERS

*M. Vivek Bharathi*  
MS. NO: 3472/18  
ph: 8122477894  
2013-2018 Batch  
School of Law,  
Sri Siva University,  
Thiruvannamalai




**Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16077 of 2025**

5. The petitioners and the second respondent are present before this Court in person. They are identified by Mr.S.Joseph Savaridoss, Special Sub Inspector of Police, District Crime Branch, Dindigul District. Both the parties confirmed the compromise arrived at between them and would submit that they have no further claims against each other.

6. In view of the same and considering the nature of the offences and the relationship between the parties, 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 C.C.No.49 of 2021 on the file of the learned Magistrate No.II, Dindigul 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 Mediation and Conciliation Centre attached to this Bench forthwith and file a photocopy of the receipt along with a memo reporting compliance in the Registry.

**23.09.2025**

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



**Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16077 of 2025**

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court No.II,  
Dindigul.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,  
District Crime Branch,  
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.



WEB COPY



***Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16077 of 2025***

**SUNDER MOHAN, J.**

Lm

**Crl.O.P(MD).No.16077 of 2025**

**23.09.2025**