

Siva Ranjith Kumar Vs State represented by

Siva Ranjith Kumar Vs State represented by

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1430721

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Mar-27-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice M. Nirmal Kumar

Appeal No. : CRL OP/6396/2026

Appellant : Siva Ranjith Kumar

Respondent : State represented by

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR Siva Ranjith Kumar
..Petitioner(s) Vs

1. State represented by The Inspector of Police, Nagapattinam Town
Police Station, Nagapattinam District. Crime No.27 of 2026.

2. Mariyammal

..Respondent(s) Prayer: This Criminal Original petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS to quash the FIR in Crime No.27 of 2026 on the file of the 1st respondent police in view of the compromise entered into between the petitioner and the 2nd respondent. For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Ramachandran For Respondent(s): Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam Additional Public Prosecutor for R1

ORDER

The petitioner, accused in Cr.No.27 of 2026 for the offence under Section115(2) and 137 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 has filed this criminal original petition seeking to quash the FIR based on the compromise entered into between the petitioner and the second respondent. Page1 of 6

2. The case against the petitioner is that the mother-in-law of the

petitioner had lodged a complaint that her second daughter was given in marriage to the petitioner ten years before and they have begotten three children, one grand son and grand daughter were residing in Tirumangalam, Perayur. One grand son and de facto complainant, daughter residing with the de facto complainant. When the daughter of the de facto complainant went to Malaysia leaving one grand son with the de facto complainant, the petitioner forcibly trespassed into the house of the de facto complainant and took away her grand child with him. Thereafter, the neighbours came there and when the car used to flee was attempted to be stopped, the petitioner dashed against one Prabakaran and one Saraswathi and fled from the scene of occurrence.

3. The contention of the petitioner is that the de facto complainant is none

other than his mother-in-law. When the daughter of the de facto complainant went to Malaysia, the petitioner came to the house of the de facto complainant and requested the de facto complainant to give his son back to him, the same was refused and thereafter a wordy altercation

between the petitioner and the de facto complainant, due to which the children started crying. Hence, the petitioner took back his children with him. However, the said act is now projected as though the petitioner trespassed into the house of the de facto complainant and took his children. Now the issue got resolved, the petitioner along with his wife are living happily and his mother-in-law is living separately Page2 of 6

on her own. Hence, he prayed to quash the case in Cr.No.27 of 2026 against the petitioner.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing for the first

respondent submits that it is a dispute between the son-in-law and mother-in-law with regard to the custody of child. He further submits that in view of the custody dispute between the petitioner and the de facto complainant, the complaint appears to have arisen out. He further submitted that the parties have now realised the mistake, come to reality, finding the complaint an exaggerated one, both mutually resolved the dispute amicably between them.

5. The petitioner and the de facto complainant/R2 appeared before this

Court and they were identified by their respective counsel. Now that, the parties have compromised and filed a joint memo of compromise along with this petition.

6. On being enquired by this Court, the de facto complainant stated that she has amicably settled the dispute with the petitioner and she is not willing to pursue the criminal proceedings and therefore, seeks to quash the same.

7. The joint memo of compromise filed by the petitioner and the second Page3 of 6 respondent is scanned and extracted hereunder: Page4 of 6 Page5 of 6

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

rap

8. Considering the relationship, and the petitioner and his wife entered

into compromise, children are living with them happily and in view of the joint memo of compromise, this Court is inclined to quash the FIR in Crime No.27 of 2026 on the file of the first respondent police and accordingly, this criminal original petition is allowed and the FIR in Crime No.27 of 2026 is hereby quashed. 27-03-2026 Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No rap To

1. The Inspector of Police, Nagapattinam Town Police Station, Nagapattinam District. Crime No.27 of 2026
2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras. Page6 of 6

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com