



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16189 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.16189 of 2025

1.B.Navaneethakrishnan

2.Bagavathi

3.Gomathi

... Petitioners/Accused 1 to 3

Vs.

1.The Tamil Nadu State rep. by,
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No. 25 of 2024)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Sivadurka

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the entire records pertaining to the case in S.C.No.266 of 2025 on the file of the Learned Fast Track Mahila Court, Dindigul District and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Balaji

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

For R-2 : Mr.N.Thinakaran



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16189 of 2025


ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioners seek to quash the final report in S.C.No.266 of 2025 on the file of the Fast Track Mahila Court, Dindigul District, which was filed for the offences under Section 69 and 351(2) of BNS, 2023.

2. The allegation in the final report is that the first petitioner and the defacto complainant were known to each other; that on the promise of marriage, the first petitioner had sexual intercourse with the defacto complainant on several occasions; that the defacto complainant helped the first petitioner by transferring money; that the first petitioner thereafter refused to marry her and refused to return the money and also committed the offence of criminal intimidation; and that the petitioners 2 and 3 had abetted the first petitioner of the alleged offences.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the allegations, even if accepted to be true, would only disclose consensual relationship and the offence under Section 69 of BNS would not be made out; and that in any case, the parties have now entered into a compromise and decided to give a quietus to the entire dispute.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16189 of 2025

4. The parties have filed a joint compromise memo dated 13th September

2025 and the scanned copy of the compromise memo reads as follows:

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
AT MADURAI BENCH
(CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)

Crl.O.P.(MD) No. of 2025
In
SC. No.266 of 2025
(On the file of the Learned Mahila Court,
Dindigul District)

1.B.Navaneethakrishnan, M/A, 29 years,
S/o.Bhagavathi,


2.Bagavathi, M/A, 60 years,
S/o. ~~Navaneethakrishnan~~

3.Gomathi F/A, 55 years,
W/o.Bagavathi,


Petitioners 1 to 3, Residing at
Nallampatti Village, Dindigul East Taluk,
Dindigul District. Petitioners / Accused No.1 to 3


1. 

2. 

3. 

(Petitioners/Accused)


(2nd Respondent/Complainant)



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16189 of 2025

WEB COPY

Vs.
1. The Tamilnadu State rep. by,
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.25 of 2024).Respondent/Complainant

2. Sivadurga, F/A, 30 years,
D/o. Subramanian,
No.73/69, North Mada Villagam,
Thiruvaidaimaruthur,
Thiruvaidaimaruthur Taluk,
Thanjavur District.612104. Respondent/De facto complainant

JOINT COMPROMISE MEMO

1. The petitioner and the 2nd respondent jointly submit that at the instance of the 2nd respondent the above said case was registered in Crime No.25 of 2024 dated 28.12.2024 by the 1st respondent against the petitioners for the offences punishable under Sections 69, 351(2) of BNS Act 2023, now both the parties have voluntarily come forward to have an amicable settlement for quashing the present S.C. No.266 of 2025, as a result of which the present compromise memo for quashing the above said SC.No.266 of 2025 is being effected before this Hon'ble Court.

1.

2.

3.

(Petitioners/Accused)

(2nd Respondent/Complainant)



WEB COPY

3


3

2. The petitioner and the 2nd respondent jointly submit that after the sessions case numbered, at the intervention of the elders, both the parties have sat together, in which an amicable conclusion has been arrived at between the petitioner and the 2nd respondent.
3. The petitioner and the 2nd respondent jointly submit that on such amicable settlement, on the date of hearing of the main quash petition before this Hon'ble Court and the 2nd respondent has also given undertaking that she would say no objection for quashing the sessions case No.266 of 2025
4. The petitioner and the 2nd respondent jointly submit that such compromise has been taken place purely with an intention to settle the peace among them and it is purely on voluntary by the parties concerned. Hence in order to avoid further ordeal of trial before the Trial Court, and save the judicial time and spent time for other cases, they are prepared to be present before this Hon'ble Court whenever it is required. This Hon'ble Court by taking into consideration of the said aspect with regard to the compromise and in the interest of the parties, can leniently look into the present issue, as such the prayer sought for by the petitioner can be allowed.

1. B. Jeyaraj
2. Anil
3. B. Anand

(Petitioners/Accused)

S. Pradeepa. S.
(2nd Respondent/Complainant)



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16189 of 2025


WEB COPY

The Petitioners and the 2nd Respondent jointly pray that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to take into consideration of the present joint compromise memo and quash the case in S.C. No.266 of 2025 on the file of the Learned Mahila Court, Dindigul District and thus render justice.

Dated at Madurai on this the 13 day of September, 2025.

1. 
2. 
3. B. Ganesan

(Petitioners/Accused)



(2nd Respondent/Complainant)


Counsel for Petitioners


Counsel for Respondent no: 2

5. The second respondent, namely, Sivadurka (Aadhaar No.5385 3098 0001) is present before this Court in person and identified by M/s.P.Saravanakumari, Woman Special Sub Inspector of Police, All Woman




Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16189 of 2025

Police Station, Dindigul District. The second respondent confirms the compromise and states that she has no objection for quashing the sessions case.

6. Considering the fact that there was a consensual relationship between the first petitioner and the defacto complainant and the nature of the allegations and the compromise arrived 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 S.C.No.266 of 2025 on the file of the Fast Track Mahila Court, Dindigul District 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.

23.09.2025

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16189 of 2025

To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16189 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Lm

Crl.O.P(MD).No.16189 of 2025

23.09.2025