

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**Criminal Application No.691 of 2019**

- 1) Rupesh s/o. Dwarkanath Jadhav,  
Age 32 years,  
Occupation : Labour.
- 2) Sham s/o. Dwarkanath Jadhav  
Age 31 years,  
Occupation: Labour.
- 3) Ram s/o Dwarkanath Jadhav,  
Age 31 years,  
Occupation: Labour

All R/o Turnagad Nagar,  
Teravi Yojna,  
Near Hanuman Temple, N-2,  
CIDCO MHADA, Mukundwadi,  
Aurangabad,  
Taluka & District Aurangabad. .. **Applicants.**

**Versus**

- 1) The State of Maharashtra,  
Through Mukundwadi Police  
Station, Aurangabad,  
Taluka & District Aurangabad.
- 2) Harshada d/o Suresh Wadte,  
Age 19 years,  
Occupation: Student,  
R/o Turnagad Nagar,  
Teravi Yojna,  
Near Hanuman Temple, N-2,  
CIDCO MHADA, Mukundwadi,  
Aurangabad,  
Taluka & District Aurangabad. .. **Respondents.**

Shri. G.R. Syed, Advocate, for applicants.

Shri. A.S. Shinde, Additional Public Prosecutor, for respondent No.1.

Shri. V.S. Salve, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

----

**Coram: T.V. NALAWADE &  
K.K. SONAWANE, JJ.**

**Date: 18 JUNE 2019**

**ORAL JUDGMENT (Per T.V. Nalawade, J.)**

1) Rule, rule made returnable forthwith. Heard both sides for final disposal.

2) The proceeding is filed for quashing of F.I.R.No.324/2018 registered with Mukundwadi Police Station, Aurangabad. for offences punishable under sections 354-A, 354-D, 34 of Indian Penal Code and Regular Criminal Case No.700/2019 filed in this crime and which is pending in the Court of Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Aurangabad.

3) During arguments learned counsel for the applicants and the learned counsel for the first informant

submitted that the parties have settled the dispute. Reply affidavit filed by respondent No.2 is on record and it shows that she has no intention to give evidence against the applicants. It appears that the applicants have shifted to other place and the first informant has no intention to give evidence against them and they want to lead peaceful life. The first informant has contended that she has decided to forgive the applicants. The applicants have given undertaking that they will not commit such offence in future.

4) In view of the above and as nothing can be achieved due to the aforesaid contentions of the first informant, this Court holds that relief needs to be granted to the applicants. In the result, the application is allowed. Relief is granted in terms of prayer clause (B). Rule is made absolute in those terms.

Sd/-  
**(K.K. SONAWANE, J.)**

Sd/-  
**(T.V. NALAWADE, J.)**

rs1