

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 601 OF 2015

Ashish Arun Mistry & Ors. .. Applicants

v/s.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr. ..Respondents

Ms. V.A. Navale for the applicants

Mr. Nitin Gangal a/w Jitendra Chinchambekar for respondent no.2

Mrs. M.M. Deshmukh, APP for respondent State

**CORAM: RANJIT MORE &
SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.
DATED: 30th JUNE, 2015.**

P.C.

1. Heard.

2. This application is filed under the provisions of Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. for quashing of the proceedings of R.C.C. No.100 of 2007, pending on the file of learned J.M.F.C. Dahanu. The said case arises out of registration of C.R. No.I-57 of 2007, registered with Dahanu Police Station at the instance of respondent no.2 for the offence punishable under Section 498A, 323, 504, 506 r/w 34

of the IPC and Section 3(31) of the Domestic Violence Act.

3. The applicant no.1 and respondent no.2 are the husband and wife. Rest of the applicants are family members of applicant no.1. Matrimonial dispute between the parties give rise to the filing of the civil as well as criminal proceedings and the subject criminal case is one of them.

4. Pending the trial, parties have settled their dispute amicably and approached this Court for quashing the subject C.R., by consent. The respondent no.2 has filed an affidavit dated 30.06.2015. In paragraph 5, she has given no objection to quash and set aside the proceedings of the subject C.R. The respondent no.2 is personally present in the Court. On specific query made by us, she submitted that she has no objection for quashing the C.R. 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 498-A 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 Criminal Application is allowed in terms of prayer clause (a). The C.R. No.I-57 of 2007 registered by the Dahanu Police Station, Thane against the aforesaid applicants being R.C.C. No.100 of 2007 is quashed and set aside.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)