

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1154 of 2018

Sumedh @ Sumit Sunil Avhad .. Applicant
Versus
The State of Maharashtra & Anr .. Respondents

...

Mr. H.M. Inamdar for the applicant.
Mr. Deepak Thakare, P.P with Mrs.P.P. Shinde, APP for the State.
Mr. S.P. Dighe for respondent no.2

**CORAM: SHRI RANJIT MORE &
SMT. BHARATI H.DANGRE, JJ.**

DATED : 4th OCTOBER, 2018

P.C:-

1 Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned counsel for respondent no.2 and the learned APP for the State.

2 The applicant has approached this Court for invoking jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to quash the proceedings of C.R.No. I – 121 of 2018 pending on the file of Addl. Sessions Judge, Nashik. The said

case arises out of the registration of the C.R.No. I - 121/18 at the instance of respondent no.3 with Sinnar Police Station at Nashik for offences punishable under Sections 354-D of the IPC and read with Sections 8 and 12 of POCSO Act.

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. Since respondent no.2 is a minor, her father has filed an affidavit dated 3rd October 2018. In the said affidavit, he has given no objection to quash the proceedings of the subject criminal case. He also states that she is giving no objection for quashing the said FIR out of free will and without there being any pressure or coercion. Both the respondent no.2 and her father are personally present before the Court. On specific query, she states she has have gone the Affidavit and understood the contents thereof.

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

1 [2014 AIRSCW 2065]

“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 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 and between buried the hatchet, we are of the opinion that the FIR is liable to be quashed.

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 Criminal Application is allowed in terms of prayer clause (a).

(SMT. BHARATI H. DANGRE, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)

Manali
Prasanna
Tilak

Digitally
signed by
Manali
Prasanna
Tilak
Date:
2018.10.08
11:17:49
+0530

Tilak