

M.Muhammad Bilal Vs The State Represented by, The Inspector of Police,

M.Muhammad Bilal Vs The State Represented by, The Inspector of Police,

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1437580

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Apr-17-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice M. Nirmal Kumar

Appeal No. : CRL OP/9360/2026

Appellant : M.Muhammad Bilal

Respondent : The State Represented by, The Inspector of Police,

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR Crl. O.P. No. 9360 of 2026 and Crl.M.P.No.6615 of 2026 M. Muhammad Bilal ..Petitioner Vs
1.The State Represented by The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station - Salem Town, Salem City, Salem District. (Crime No.4 of 2025)
2.H. Asma ..Respondents Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS to call for the records culminating Spl.S.C.No.114 of 2025, pending on the file of the learned Special Court for the Exclusive

Trial of Cases under POCSO Act, Salem and quash the same. For
Petitioner: Mr. Ali Hassan Khan

For Respondents: Mr. R. Vinothraja, Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for
R1 Page1 of 5

ORDER

The petitioner who is an accused in Spl.S.C.No.114 of 2025, facing trial for offences under Sections 5(1), 6 of the Protection of Child From Sexual Offences Act, 2012, Section 66E of Information Technology Act, 2000 and Sections 366 and 506(i) IPC before the Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Cases under the POCSO Act, Salem, has filed this Criminal Original Petition.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant was a minor

girl studying in 11th standard at Government Higher Secondary School, Salem. During that time, she became acquainted with the petitioner, and they developed a relationship. It is alleged that on 12.12.2023, the petitioner took the victim to his house and had sexual intercourse with her. It is further alleged that the accused took intimate photographs and recorded videos of the victim. Subsequently, when the victim resisted and refused to continue the relationship, the accused threatened her with dire consequences by using such materials. Based on the complaint lodged by the victim, a case in Crime No.4 of 2025 was registered by the respondent police for offences under Sections 5(1), 6 of the Protection of Child From Sexual Offences Act, 2012, Section 66E of Information Technology Act, 2000 and Sections 366 and 506(i) IPC. On completion of the investigation, the 1st respondent Police filed a charge sheet before the trial Court, listing 16 witnesses and the relevant documents.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner and 2nd respondent were married on 16.10.2025 and that their marriage was registered on 05.03.2026. He further submitted that they are leading a happy marital life. Hence, he prayed for quashing of the proceedings.
4. The case is at the stage of trial. By passage of time, the parties have decided to bury their hatchet and compromise the dispute amicably among themselves.
5. Today the petitioner and the 2nd respondent appeared through video

conferencing and their identities were confirmed by the 1st 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 petitioner and the 2nd respondent have filed separate affidavits before this Court and have also filed a Joint Compromise Memo. The Apex Court in the case of K.Dhandapani vs. State by the Inspector of Police reported in 2022 SCC Online SC 1056, considered the subsequent events and observed that the Court cannot shut its eyes to the ground reality and disturb the happy family life of the petitioners as well as the victim. In view of the same, this Court finds that continuation of the proceedings will serve no purpose and it is only an abuse of process of law. Page3 of 5

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and as a sequel, the proceedings in Spl.S.C.No.114 of 2025 on the file of the Special Court for the Exclusive Trial of Cases under POCSO Act, Salem is quashed against the petitioner. 17-04-2026 Neutral Citation: Yes/No AT To 1.The Special Court for the Exclusive Trial of Cases under POCSO Act, Salem. 2.The Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station - Salem Town, Salem City, Salem District. 3.The Public Prosecutor High Court of Madras Page4 of 5

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

