

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 2823 OF 2015

Mr.Suresh Yallappa Shriram

..Petitioner

v/s.

The State of Maharashtra & ors.

..Respondents

Ms. Sangeeta Sachdev for the Petitioner.

Ms. Razia Shaikh for the Respondent No.3.

Mrs. M.H.Mhatre, APP for the Respondent/State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.
DATED : JULY 28, 2015.**

P.C.

1. Heard. The writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, r/w. the provisions of section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, to quash and set aside the proceeding of C.C.No. 134/PW/2014 pending on the file of the Metropolitan Magistrate's 12th Court, Bandra, Mumbai. The said case arises out of registration of C.R.No. 93 of 2013 with Shahu Nagar Police Station, Mumbai, at the instance of respondent no.3 for offences under Section 498A, 406, 504, 323, 494 r/w. 34 of Indian Penal Code.

2. The petitioner and the respondent nos.3 are husband and wife. Matrimonial dispute gave rise to filing of criminal cases. However, pending trial of the said case parties settled their disputes amicably and have approached this Court for quashing the subject proceeding by consent.

3. Respondent No.3 has filed an affidavit dated 16th July, 2014. In paragraph 4. of the said affidavit, she has given no objection for quashing the subject criminal case.

4. Respondent No.3 is personally present before the Court. On specific query made by us, she submitted that she has made the said statement in the affidavit on her own free will, without there being any pressure or undue influence. She has further confirmed that she has no objection for quashing the criminal proceedings in question initiated by her against the Petitioner for the offence punishable under sections 498A, 406, 504, 323, 494 r/w. 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

5. 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 498A 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.”

6. Similar view has been taken by the Full Bench of this Court in Abasaheb Yadav Honmane vs. State of Maharashtra [2008(5) LJ.Soft. 461].

7. It can, thus, be seen that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties. From the perusal of complaint, it transpires that the allegations are totally personal in nature. There is no element of public law involved in the crime. In these circumstances, and especially, in

view of the law laid down by the Apex Court in the case of Madan Mohan Abbot vs. State of Punjab, [(2008) 4 SCC 582], we find that no purpose would be served by keeping the criminal proceedings pending except burdening the Criminal Courts which are already overburdened.

8. In the light of the principles laid down by the Apex Court in the aforesaid decision as well as in the case of Narinder Singh vs. State of Punjab [2014 AIR SCW 2065] we are of the considered view that there is no impediment in quashing the criminal proceedings.

9. Accordingly, petition is allowed in terms of prayer clause (b).

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)