

Tilak

3 Pending trial as well as pending this petition, parties have settled their dispute amicably and in view of the understanding arrived at, have approached this Court for quashing of the subject FIR by consent. Respondent no.2 has filed an affidavit dated 3rd September 2018. By the said affidavit, he has given no objection to quash the proceedings of the subject criminal case. Respondent no.2 is personally present. He also states that he is giving no objection for quashing the said FIR out of free will and without there being any pressure or coercion.

4 The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Narinder Singh vs. State of Punjab***¹ has observed thus :-

“14. As to under what circumstances the criminal proceedings in a non-compoundable case be quashed when there is a settlement between the parties, the Court provided the following guidelines :

“Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceedings having regard to the facts that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its

1 [2014 AIRSCW 2065]

opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor. No doubt, crimes are acts which have harmful effect on the public and consist in wrongdoing that seriously endangers and threatens the well-being of the society and it is not safe to leave the crime-doer only because he and the victim have settled the dispute amicably or that the victim has been paid compensation, yet certain crimes have been made compoundable in law, with or without the permission of the Court.”

In the light of the aforesaid observations we have noted that the two rival parties have amicably settled dispute between themselves and have buried the hatchet, and in this backdrop, it would be unfair and contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings.

5 In the backdrop of above facts and circumstances and especially in view of law laid down by the Apex Court in the case of **Narinder Singh** (supra), we find that 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 criminal proceedings are required to be quashed. However, at the same time, costs need to be saddled on the parties for putting into motion the police and judicial mechanism for settling their personal disputes.

6 Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed in terms of prayer clause (a) subject to payment of costs of Rs.25,000/- by the petitioners to the account of Tata Memorial Hospital within a period of four weeks from today. The petitioners shall pay the said costs and produce the receipt thereof on the file of this Court within a period of six weeks from today, failing which, the aforesaid order allowing the Writ Petition would automatically stand recalled.

(SMT. BHARATI H. DANGRE, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)

Manali
Prasanna
Tilak

Digitally signed
by Manali
Prasanna Tilak
Date:
2018.10.09
12:08:37
+0530

Tilak