



Crl.O.P.No.14311 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 12.06.2026

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Crl.O.P.No.14311 of 2026
and Crl.M.P.No.9177 of 2026

Rajasekar

.. Petitioner

Versus

1. State Rep by
Inspector of Police,
Dharapuram Police Station,
Tiruppur District.
(Crime No.422 of 2024)

2. Vijaya
3. Nadhiya

.. Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records and quash the final report in Spl.S.C.No.9 of 2025 on the file of the Mahila Court, Tiruppur under the ground of compromise.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Esakkimuthu

For Respondents : Mr.R.Rajasekaran,
Counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu
(Criminal Side), for R1



Crl.O.P.No.14311 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner / accused facing trial in Spl.S.C.No.9 of 2025 on the file of the learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Tiruppur for the offences punishable under Section 5(l), 6 and 5(u) of the POCSO Act; Section 9 of the Child Marriage Restraint Act, 1929 and Section 366 of I.P.C, has filed this quash petition.

2. The contention of the petitioner / accused is that the case of the prosecution arose from a missing person complaint lodged by the second respondent (the mother of the victim), alleging that the petitioner influenced the minor victim/third respondent, married her at Vinayagar Kovil in Palani, and subsequently engaged in a physical relationship. Based on this complaint, the respondent police registered Crime No.422 of 2024, which culminated in a final report facing trial in Spl.S.C.No. 9 of 2025 on the file of the Mahila Court, Tiruppur, for offences under Sections 5(l), 5(u), and 6 of the POCSO Act, read with Section 9 of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act and Section 366 of the IPC. However, it is submitted that the petitioner and the third respondent were deeply in love and married without their families' permission, unaware of the legal consequences due to their young age (the petitioner being 22 and the



Crl.O.P.No.14311 of 2026

victim being 17 at the time). The third respondent has since attained majority, and both of them are married on 09.04.2025 and is currently residing together, leading a peaceful and happy matrimonial life. The parties have entered into this compromise voluntarily without any coercion. Hence, praying for quashing the case on the ground of compromise.

3. The learned Counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu (Crl. Side) for the first respondent submitted that based on the complaint given by the second respondent, F.I.R in Crime No.422 of 2024 has been registered and investigation has been completed and charge sheet has been filed in Spl.S.C.No.9 of 2025 before the learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Tiruppur for the offences punishable under Sections 5(l), 5(u), and 6 of the POCSO Act, read with Section 9 of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act and Section 366 of the IPC. He further submitted that now the case is at the stage of pending trial. In the meantime, both the petitioner and the second respondent arrived at a compromise and settled the issues between them.

4. Considering the submissions made by the parties and on



Crl.O.P.No.14311 of 2026

perusal of entire materials, it is seen that the case is pending trial. At this stage and also by passage of time, the parties have decided to bury their hatchet and decided to compromise the dispute amicably among themselves.

5. Today, the petitioners and the second respondent are present before this Court and their identity is confirmed by Mr.Ramachandran, Inspector of Police attached to the first respondent Police Station. This Court also enquired both the parties and was satisfied that the parties have come to an amicable settlement between themselves. The parties have filed a joint compromise memo to that effect duly signed by both of them.

6. Under such circumstances, no useful purpose will be served in keeping Spl.S.C.No.9 of 2025 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 Gurjarth and Another** reported in **(2019) 2 MLJ Crl 10**, this Court in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,



Crl.O.P.No.14311 of 2026

quashes Spl.S.C.No.9 of 2025 on the file of the Mahila Court, Tiruppur.

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and consequently, Spl.S.C.No.9 of 2025 on the file of the Mahila Court, Tiruppur district, is quashed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

12.06.2026

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

To

1. The Mahila Court,
Tiruppur.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Dharapuram Police Station,
Tiruppur District.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.14311 of 2026

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

grs

Crl.O.P.No.14311 of 2026
and Crl.M.P.No.9177 of 2026

12.06.2026