

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1193 OF 2015

Harish Daulat Ram Girdhar & Ors. .. Petitioners

v/s.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr. ..Respondents

Mr. Vaibhav Punekar for the petitioners

Mr. Ashok M. Wanwani for respondent no.2.

Mr. S.K. Shinde, PP a/w Mr. K.V. Saste, APP for the respondent
State

**CORAM: RANJIT MORE &
SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.**

DATED: 31st MARCH, 2015.

P.C.

1. Learned Counsel for the petitioners at the outset seeks leave to amend the petition so as to withdraw the allegations made in the petition, against the respondent no.2 wife. Leave is granted. Necessary amendment shall be carried out forthwith.

2. Heard. The petitioners have approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India under the provisions of

Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. for quashing the proceedings of the FIR bearing No.126 of 2014, registered with RAK Marg Police Station, Mumbai. The said C.R. is registered against the petitioners at the instance of respondent no.2 for offence punishable under Sections 498A, 323, 406, 504, 506 r/w 34 of the IPC.

3. The petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 are husband and wife. Rest of the petitioners are family members of the petitioner no.1. Matrimonial dispute between the parties led to the filing of the subject FIR.

4. During the investigation, parties have settled their matrimonial dispute amicably and in pursuance of the said understanding, they have filed the present petition for quashing of the aforesaid C.R. by consent. They have also filed Memorandum of Understanding, dated 9th March, 2015. The MoU is annexed at Exhibit-B to the petition. A perusal of the said MoU indicates that parties have settled their matrimonial dispute amicably and they

agreed to withdraw the allegations made against each other and to give no objection for quashing the proceedings of the aforesaid C.R. On specific query made by us, she submitted that she has no objection for quashing the FIR and consequential criminal proceedings.

5. It can, thus, be seen that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties. From the perusal of the complaint, it would reveal that the dispute between the parties is purely a matrimonial dispute. In that view of the matter, we find that in the interest of justice, the criminal proceedings are required to be quashed.

6. The Apex Court in *B. S. Joshi vs. State of Haryana reported [AIR 2003 SC 1386]* has held that in the event of settlement of matrimonial dispute, the FIR under Section 498-A can be quashed, even though, the said offence is not compoundable in terms of Section 320 of the Cr.P.C. The relevant

observations of the Apex Court are contained in Paras 14 and 15 which are reproduced herein below:

“14. There is no doubt that the object of introducing Chapter XX-A containing Section 498A in the Indian Penal Code was to prevent the torture to a woman by her husband or by relatives of her husband. Section 498A was added with a view to punishing a husband and his relatives who harass or torture the wife to coerce her or her relatives to satisfy unlawful demands of dowry. The hyper-technical view would be counter productive and would act against interests of women and against the object for which this provision was added. There is every likelihood that non-exercise of inherent power to quash the proceedings to meet the ends of justice would prevent women from settling earlier. That is not the object of Chapter XXA of Indian Penal Code.

15. In view of the above discussion, we hold that the High Court in exercise of its inherent powers can quash criminal proceedings or FIR or complaint and Section 320 of the Code does not limit or affect the powers under Section 482 of the Code.”

7. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is made absolute in terms of prayer clause (a).

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)