



Crl.O.P.No.6220 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.03.2026

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Crl.O.P.No.6220 of 2026

Mansoor Ahamed

.. Petitioner

Versus

**1. The Inspector of Police,
F5 Choolaimedu Police Station,
Chennai – 600 094.
(Crime No.638 of 2025)**

2. A.Muthukumari

.. Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for records relating to FIR in Crime No.638 of 2025 pending on the file of the Inspector of Police, F5 Choolaimedu Police Station, Chennai and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Saravanan

**For Respondents : Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam,
Additional Public Prosecutor, for R1**



Crl.O.P.No.6220 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner/accused, in Crime No.638 of 2025 registered for offences under Sections 296(b) and 115(2) of B.N.S.S and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002, has filed this quash application.

2. The contention of the petitioner/accused is that the petitioner is having an egg mart adjacent to the Jasmine Apartment and the second respondent/de facto complainant and her husband are doing watch and ward in the apartment. They were always intruding into the business of the petitioner/accused and also obstructing of arranging the trace in front of the shop and also complaining that pungent smell is emanating from the shop. The petitioner/accused submitted that it is a part of the business and that they are carrying out the business even before the apartment has come there and that now, raising such objections is not sustainable.

3. Keeping this in mind, a wordy quarrel with regard to parking of a load van had been projected as if the petitioner/accused had abused and assaulted the victim. In fact, the victim had fell on a gate while she was chased away which was projected as if the petitioner/accused had



Crl.O.P.No.6220 of 2026

assaulted her.

WEB COPY

4. Now, compromise has been entered into between the petitioner/accused and the second respondent/de facto complainant and all agreed that the issue could be resolved and the matter has been compromised. The second respondent/de facto complainant has also given a letter to the respondent Police to withdraw the complaint and not to further proceed with the case. The petitioner/accused, in support of her contention, has produced the joint compromise memo in page No.29 of the affidavit.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the first respondent submits that in this case, the de facto complainant is a lady. She, along with her husband, Arokiasamy, are doing watch and ward in the Jasmine Apartment. They have two sons Veda Antony and Gilbert. On 12.09.2025, at about 10.30 A.M, a load van was parked near the gate at the entrance of the apartment, for which, the second respondent/de facto complainant questioned. At that time, the petitioner/accused came there, abused her and assaulted her. Later, she was taken for treatment to the Best Hospital. A complaint was received and an F.I.R was registered in



Crl.O.P.No.6220 of 2026

this case. Now, the investigation has been completed and the Final Report in e-filing No.LTN20230000809C202500253 has been filed before the learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai.

6. The de facto complainant and the petitioner have appeared before this Court. On interaction, the second respondent/de facto complainant agreed to withdraw the complaint and submits that she is not interested in further continuing with the case and that the case had originated due to exchange of words in the heat of passion. Considering the submissions made that the petitioner/accused is having an egg mart next to the second respondent/de facto complainant's flat and further, after the incident, the petitioner/accused continues to have his business and the second respondent/de facto complainant continues to be the watchman in the apartment and that there are no further incidents thereafter and now, at the intervention of the common friends and elders, the issue has been resolved, this Court is inclined to quash the F.I.R in Crime No.638 of 2025 on the file of the first respondent.

7. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. The F.I.R in Crime No.638 of 2025 on the file of the first respondent



Crl.O.P.No.6220 of 2026

Police, stands quashed and consequently, the Final Report, filed in e-filing

No.LTN20230000809C202500253 on the file of the learned XVII

Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai, also stands quashed.

11.03.2026

Index : yes/no
Speaking order/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation : yes/no
grs

To

1. The XVII Metropolitan Magistrate,
Saidapet, Chennai.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.
3. The Inspector of Police,
F5 Choolaimedu Police Station,
Chennai – 600 094.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6220 of 2026

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

grs

Crl.O.P.No.6220 of 2026

11.03.2026