

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.3031 OF 2015

Sunil Anil Chhatre & Anr.

.. Petitioners

v/s.

Mrs. Nivedita Sunil Chatre & Anr.

..Respondents

Mr. Abhijit D. Sarwate for the petitioners

Mr. Asim Sarode for respondent no.1

Mrs. S.V. Sonawane, APP for respondent State

CORAM: RANJIT MORE &

SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.

DATED: 11th AUGUST, 2015.

P.C.

1. Heard. learned Counsel for the respective parties and learned APP for the State.

2. This petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for quashing of proceedings of the R.C.C. No.4719 of 2014, pending on the file of learned J.M.F.C., Pune. The said case arises out of registration of FIR, being C.R. No.118 of 2014 with Kothrud Police Station, Pune, at the instance of respondent no.1 for the

offence punishable under Section 420 and 498A of the IPC.

3. The marriage of petitioner no.1 and respondent no.1 was solemnized on 24.09.2012. The petitioner no.2 is the father of petitioner no.1. Matrimonial dispute between the parties led to the filing of the civil as well as criminal proceedings against each other. The subject criminal case being R.C.C. No.4719 of 2014 is one of them.

4. Pending trial, parties have settled their dispute amicably and in pursuance of the said understanding, they have filed the present petition for quashing and setting aside the subject criminal case, by consent. The respondent no.1 has filed an affidavit dated 6th August, 2015. In paragraph 8, she has stated that she has no objection to quash the said criminal proceedings. Respondent no.1 is personally present in the Court. 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 (b). The FIR No.118 of 2014 registered by the Kothrud Police Station, Pune against the aforesaid petitioners being R.C.C. No.4719 of 2014 is quashed and set aside.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)