



3. The petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2 are the husband and wife. The rest of the petitioners are the relations of the petitioner no.1. The marital discord between the parties gave rise to the civil as well as criminal proceedings. The subject criminal case is one of them.

4. During the pendency of the said criminal case, with the intervention of relatives and friends, the parties settled their dispute amicably and in pursuance of the understanding arrived at between them, they have approached this Court for quashing of the subject criminal case by consent.

5. The respondent no.2 has also filed an affidavit dated 13/05/2017. In the paragraph no.7 of the said affidavit, she has prayed that she does not want to litigate any further nor does she want to continue with the subject FIR and therefore she has no objection for quashing and setting aside the subject FIR.

6. The respondent no.2 is personally present before the Court. On a specific query, she states that she has gone through the contents of the petition and the affidavit and understood the same. She has also stated that she has no objection to quash and set aside the subject criminal case. She has also stated that she is giving the no objection out of her free will and without any force or coercion.

8. It can, thus, be seen that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties. Perusal of the complaint, makes it clear that the allegations are totally personal in nature. In these circumstances and especially in view of the law laid down by the Apex Court in the case of *B. S. Joshi Vs. State of Haryana*<sup>1</sup>, we are of the view that quashing of the proceedings of the criminal case would be in the interest of respondent no.2. Besides, 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 subject criminal case is required to be quashed. The petition is, accordingly, made absolute in terms of prayer clause (B) and is disposed of as such.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)

---

<sup>1</sup> AIR 2003 SC 1386