



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

CRL OP No. 7357 of 2026

Selvaraj

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State rep.by its,
Sub Inspector of Police,
Acharapakkam,
Chengalpattu District.
2. Sumathi

..Respondent(s)

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, pleased to call for the records and quash the Charge sheet in CC.No.577/2025 pending on the file of the Learned Judicial Magistrate II, Madhurantakam, Chengalpattu District.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.G.Srinivasan

For Respondent(s):

Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam
Additional Public Prosecutor
Assisted by M/s.Harshana.T
Mr.S.Balaji for R2

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition was filed to quash the proceedings in CC.No.577 of 2025 pending on the file of the Learned Judicial Magistrate II, Madhurantakam, Chengalpattu District, in Cr.No.382/2023 registered for the offences under Section 294 (b), 323, 324, 506 (2) and 354 A of I.P.C. and Section 4 of TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002, on the file of the first respondent.



2.The case of the prosecution is that on 11.10/2023, at about 7.00 a.m., the petitioner used derogative words against the defacto-complainant stating that he will pay Rs.1000/- to her and called her out. The defacto-complainant got offended abused him and shouted at him and later lodged a complaint.

3.The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner and the defacto-complainant are neighbours and distant relatives. There was some family dispute between them with regard to cleaning of the area and storing of cow dungs in front of the petitioner's house. Thereafter, it is projected petitioner called the defacto-complainant and a false complaint lodged. He further submitted that the petitioner not involved in any activities as alleged by the 2nd respondent and not used filthy language or physical violence against the 2nd respondent. He further submits that on realising the mistake, and lodged the complaint in impulsive now considering the well-being and future, the 2nd respondent is not willing to proceed further with the complaint against the petitioner. Both the petitioner and the 2nd respondent arrived at a compromise and resolved the issue. Hence, he prays for quashing.

4.Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the 1st respondent Police submitted that based on the complaint given by the defacto-complainant a case has been registered in Cr.No.382/2023 for the offences under Section



294 (b), 323, 324, 506 (2) and 354 (A) of I.P.C. and Section 4 of TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002. Now, charge sheet filed in CC.No.577/2025. In the meantime, both the petitioner and the 2nd respondent arrived at a compromise and settled the issues.

5.Considering the submissions and on perusal of materials, it is seen that investigation is completed and charge sheet filed in CC.No.577/2025 filed before the Learned Judicial Magistrate II, Madhurantakam, Chengalpattu District By passage of time, the parties have decided to bury their hatchet and compromise the dispute amicably among themselves.

6.Today the petitioner and the 2nd respondent appeared before this Court in person and their identity is confirmed by M/s.Vijayakumar, Police Constable, attached to the 1st respondent Police Station. This Court enquired both the parties and satisfied parties have come to an amicable settlement between themselves. The petitioner and the 2nd respondent have filed Joint Compromise Memo before this Court.

7.Under such circumstances, no useful purpose will be served in keeping the First Information Report pending, even though, the offences involved are not compoundable in nature. In the light of the guidelines given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **2017 9 SCC 641-(Parbathbhai Aahir @**



Parbathbhai Vs. State of Gujrath), and after exercising due caution as advised by the Hon'ble Suprme Court in ***The State of Madhya Pradesh v. Dhruv Gurjar and Another*** reported in ***(2019) 2 MLJ Crl 10***), this Court in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C., quashes the First Information Report on the file of the 1st respondent Police.

8.This Criminal Original Petition stands allowed, the case in Cr.No.382 of 2023 is hereby quashed. Consequently, the case in CC.No.577/2025 pending on the file of the Learned Judicial Magistrate II, Madhurantakam, Chengalpattu District, is also quashed. Consequently, connected Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

27-03-2026

ep



To

1. The State rep.by its,
Sub Inspector of Police,
Acharapakkam,
Chengalpattu District.

2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras.

3. The Judicial Magistrate II
Madurantakam,
Chengalpattu.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 7357 of 2



M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

ep

CRL OP No. 7357 of 2026

27-03-2026