

BDPPS

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.3080 OF 2016

Mr. Siddharth Prabhat Chhabra & Ors Petitioners.

V/s

The State of Maharashtra and Anr. Respondents.

WITH

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.3107 OF 2016

Mrs. Chetna Parag Agarwal and Anr.Petitioners.

V/s

The State of Maharashtra and Anr. Respondents.

Mr. Satyam R. Dubey for the Petitioners in both the above Writ Petitions.

Mr. K.V. Saste, APP for the State in Writ Petition No.3080 of 2016.

Mrs. S.V. Sonawane for the State in Writ Petition No.3107 of 2016.

Mr. J.S. Sharma for Respondent No.2 in both the above Writ Petitions.

**CORAM: V. M. KANADE &
Ms. NUTAN D. SARDESSAI, JJ.**

DATE: 16th December, 2016

P.C.:-

1] Heard the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioners and the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent No.2.

2] Both these Petitions have been filed for quashing the criminal complaint filed by Respondent No.2 for the offences punishable under sections 143, 147, 149, 354, 323, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3] Parties have amicably settled all their disputes which are pending against each other. Petitioners are in-laws of the complainant's sister. Divorce proceedings were filed by her sister against her husband and those proceedings have been settled. All the parties are present in Court.

4] We have interviewed Respondent No.2. She has stated that she has no objection if the complaint is quashed. Respondent No.2's sister has received an amount of Rs 10 lakhs towards permanent alimony.

5] Taking into consideration all these facts, in our view, quashing of the complaint is in the best interest of the parties. In view of the ratio

of the judgment in *B.S. Joshi Vs. State of Haryana*¹, there is no impediment in quashing this complaint.

6] Both these Writ Petitions are therefore allowed in terms of prayer clause (a) and disposed of.

(Ms. NUTAN D. SARDESSAI, J.)

(V.M. KANADE, J.)

¹ AIR 2003 SC 1386