

SSK

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 2760 OF 2015**

1. Shri Harishchandra Shivram Thakre	
2. Shri Nathuram Shivram Thakre	Petitioners
versus	
1. Lata Baraku Belawale	
2. The State of Maharashtra	Respondents

Mr. Vijay Killedar, advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. M. N. Sandhyanshiv, advocate for respondent No.1.
Mrs. M. H. Mhatre, APP for the State.

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

DATED : 14th JULY, 2015.

P.C.:

Heard learned counsel and learned APP appearing for the respective parties.

2. The petition is filed for quashing FIR bearing Crime No.256 of 2015 registered with Hill Line Police Station, Taluka – Ambernath, District Thane, at the instance of respondent No.1 for the offences punishable under Sections 417, 420, 467, 468, 471 read with Section 120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

3. Pending investigation, the parties to the petition settled their dispute amicably and, in pursuance of an understanding arrived at

between them, filed the instant petition for quashing the proceedings of subject FIR by consent. Respondent No.1 has filed an affidavit dated 13th July, 2015. In paragraph 1, she has stated that she has no objection for quashing the proceedings of the subject FIR. Respondent No.1 is personally present before the Court. On being questioned, she specifically stated that she has gone through the affidavit and has fully understood the contents thereof and has no objection, if the proceedings arising out of said FIR are quashed and set-aside. She also stated that she is giving no objection for quashing the said proceedings out of free will and without there being any pressure or coercion.

3. It can, thus, be seen that the dispute was totally personal in nature, which has now been settled amicably. In these circumstances and especially in view of law laid down by the Apex Court in the case of **Narinder Singh and ors. versus State of Punjab and anr. 2014 AIR (SCW) 2065**, we find that no purpose would be served by keeping the criminal proceedings pending except burdening the criminal Courts which are already overburdened. In that view of the matter and in the interests of justice, the criminal proceedings are required to be quashed and set-aside. However, at the same time, costs need to be saddled on the parties for using the police and judicial mechanism for settling their personal disputes.

4. Accordingly, the petition is allowed in terms of prayer clause (b) subject to payment of cost of Rs.10,000/- by the petitioners to **“Shanti Avedna Sadan”** an institution that takes care of the advanced and terminally ill cancer patients. The petitioners shall pay the said cost and thereafter produce the receipt thereof on the file of this petition within a period of two weeks from today, failing which, the criminal writ petition shall stand dismissed automatically without further reference to the Court.
5. Subject to above, the criminal writ petition stands disposed of.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)