



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRL OP No. 32641 of 2025

Dhakshinamurthi (minor)

Rep by his Father and Natural Guardian

R. Dhivakar, S/o. Ramalingam, No. 1A, Seetharam
Nagar, 3rd Street, Kodungaiyur, Chennai - 600118.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State Rep. By
The Inspector of Police, W-18 AWPS, MKB
Nagar, Chennai.

2. Ragu,
S/o. Sachithanantham, No. F1, 4/9,
Kattabomman 6th Street, Kodungaiyur,
Chennai - 600118.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records and to compromise and quash the FIR in Crime No.39/2025 dated 17.10.2025 registered by the Inspector of Police, on the file of W-18, AWPS, MKB Nagar, Chennai, in respect of the petitioner.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.K.V.Muthuvisakan

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Vinoth Kumar, G.A (Crl.Side) for R1
Mr.C.T.Saravanan for R2

- - - - -



ORDER

WEB COPY This criminal original petition has been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.39 of 2025 dated 17.10.2025 registered by the Inspector of Police, on the file of W-18, AWPS, MKB Nagar, Chennai, in respect of the petitioner, on the basis of the compromise arrived at between the petitioner and the second respondent/*de facto* complainant.

2. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

3. The case of the prosecution is that based on a complaint given by the second respondent/*de facto* complainant that the petitioner had misbehaved with his daughter (victim girl) aged about 13 years, the aforesaid case in Crime No.39 of 2025 was registered by the first respondent police for the offences under Sections 7 and 8 of POCSO Act.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is a minor and the aforesaid incident is said to have happened near a tuition centre at about 8 p.m.; due to mistaken identity and misunderstanding, the petitioner was fixed as an accused in this case; later, the parents of the petitioner met the parents of the victim girl and explained about the manner in which the incident had happened; on getting convinced with the explanation



offered by the parents of the petitioner, the second respondent/de facto complainant accepted to withdraw the case; consequently, the parties have amicably settled the issue among themselves, taking into consideration of the future of the two youngsters; in such circumstances, the pendency of the FIR will only be a harassment to both the petitioner as well as the victim who are teenagers; hence, this criminal original petition has been filed in pursuance of the compromise arrived at between the parties.

5. The petitioner, who is a minor, was present before this Court along with his parents and likewise, the second respondent/*de facto* complainant also appeared before this Court with his daughter/victim girl and the said parties were identified by their respective counsel as well as by the first respondent Police.

6. On being enquired by this Court, the second respondent/*de facto* complainant stated that since the incident happened during night hours, owing to mistaken identity, his daughter had given the name of the petitioner to be the person who had misbehaved with her; later, the second respondent/de facto complainant and his daughter came to know that the petitioner had not committed the offence and hence, he does not want to pursue the matter any further.



7. When both sides who are present before this Court have categorically stated in one voice that it is not the petitioner who had committed the alleged offence and hence, they have amicably settled the dispute between themselves and when this stand of theirs is also supported by their respective affidavits and also joint compromise memo, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the impugned FIR pending.

8. In such perspective of the matter, this Court, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 528 BNSS, is inclined to quash the impugned FIR and the same is accordingly quashed.

9. In the result, this criminal original petition stands allowed. The affidavits and the joint memo of compromise filed by the petitioner and the second respondent/de facto complainant for compromising the offences shall form part of the records.

25-02-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
GSK/cad



To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
W-18 AWPS, MKB Nagar,
Chennai.
- 2.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 32641 of 2025



A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

gsk/cad

CRL OP No. 32641 of 2025

25-02-2026