

admission of his son in Siddharth college. They have amicably settled the dispute. Respondent No. 2 has filed an affidavit stating that he has no objection if the complaint is quashed. The Applicant is a young boy of 23 years. He is taking education in the college. The complainant and his son are present in the Court. We had directed both the parties to remain present alongwith their parents, so that we can talk to Applicant's parents. Applicant's mother is present. Since the complaint has been filed for the offence punishable under Section 420 read with 34 of the IPC, and the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled, we are of the view that ratio of the judgments in the cases of - (i) ***Narinder Singh & Ors., Appellants Vs. State of Punjab & Anr., Respondents [(2014) 6 SCC 466]***; and (ii) ***Gian Singh, Appellant Vs. State of Punjab & Anr., Respondents [(2012) 10 SCC 303]*** will squarely apply to the facts of the present case. We are also of the view that the applicant and the complainant's son should realise their mistake, and should ensure that in future they will not commit such mistake, which will spoil their career and name of the parents. Both the boys are from the respective family, and the complaint filed against the other co-accused has been quashed by the

other Division Bench of this Court. Even we had asked the other co-accused to remain present. However, it appears that since the counsel for the applicant is not appearing, they could not contact. So, the matter is kept at 5.15 p.m. in the chamber. We have met parents and the children in the chamber. They have expressed remorse towards the incident. We are satisfied that quashing of the complaint is in the interest of the applicant, complainant's son and their respective family. Criminal application is, therefore, allowed in terms of prayer clause (a), and is accordingly disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Sd/-

[Ms. NUTAN D. SARDESSAI, J.]

Sd/-

[V. M. KANADE, J.]

Vinayak Halemath