

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 2045 OF 2018

1. Anil Jijaji Ubale
Age: 36 years, Occu.: Labourer,
R/o Vitkheda, Vedant Nagar, Satara Area,
Aurangabad, Tq. & Dist. Aurangabad
 2. Radhabai Jijaji Ubale
Age: 57 years, Occu.: Service,
R/o At Nanded for service purpose and
permanently at Vitkheda, Vedant Nagar,
Satara Area, Aurangabad, Tq. & Dist. Aurangabad
 3. Sau. Savita Ramesh Gaikwad
Age: 32 years, Occu.: Household,
R/o Anand Nagar, Jalna, Tq. & Dist. Jalna.
 4. Sau Nirmala Vinod Yengade
Age: 42 years, Occu.: Household,
R/o Home Guard Colony, Vasmat,
Tq. Vasmat, Dist. Hingoli.
 5. Sau. Vidya Vijay Umbare
Age: 31 years, Occu.: Household,
R/o Ambedkar Nagar, Vasmat,
Tq. Vasmat, Dist. Hingoli.
- ..APPLICANTS
- VERSUS
1. State of Maharashtra
 2. Sau. Shilpa Anil Ubale
Age: 30 years, Occu.: Household,
R/o Ambedkar Nagar, Vasmat,
Tq. Vasmat, Dist. Hingoli.
- ..RESPONDENTS

....

Mr. H.V. Tungar, Advocate for applicants
Mr. R.V. Dasalkar, A.P.P. for respondent no.1 – State
Mr. N.B. Jadhav, Advocate h/f Mr. Y.K. Delmade, Advocate for respondent
no.2

....

**CORAM : S.S. SHINDE AND
R.G. AVACHAT, JJ.
DATED : 25th FEBRUARY, 2019**

ORAL JUDGMENT (PER : S.S. SHINDE, J.)

Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith and heard finally with the consent of the learned Counsel for the parties.

2. By order dated 24th September, 2018 passed by this Court (Coram : T.V. Nalawade and Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi, JJ), parties were sent for mediation to the Mediator, High Court Medication Center. It is submitted that the parties have settled the dispute. Respondent No.2 has filed affidavit. It appears that pursuant to such compromise, Respondent No.2 is residing with Applicant No.1 from 26th November, 2018 in her matrimonial home. Keeping in view the compromise arrived at between the parties, Applicant No.1 and Respondent No.2 are residing together happily from 26th November, 2018. In that view of the matter, the learned Counsel for Respondent No.2, on instructions, submits that Respondent No.2 has no objection for quashing the F.I.R.

3. In the light of discussion hereinabove, Criminal Application is allowed in terms of payer clause [B]. Rule made absolute in the above terms.

(R.G. AVACHAT, J.)

(S.S. SHINDE, J.)

SSD