

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 269 OF 2021

1. Vitthal s/o Hiranman Karale
Age : 65 years, Occ : Agri.,
2. Ramdas s/o Hiranman Karale
Age : 57 years, Occ : Agri.,
3. Ganesh s/o Vitthal Karale
Age : 35 years, Occu. : Agri.,
4. Shivaji s/o Ganesh Karale
Age : 38 years, Occu : Agri.,
5. Mahadev s/o Kisan Karale
Age : 46 years, Occu. : Agri.,
6. Sanjay s/o Ramdas Karale
Age : 32 years, Occ.: Agri.,
7. Ashok s/o Vitthal Karale
Age : 32 years, Occ.: Agri.,

All R/o. Agadgaon, Tq. Nagar,
Dist. Ahmednagar

.... APPLICANTS

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through In-charge Officer,
Nagar Taluka Police Station, Nagar,
Tq. Nagar, Dist. Ahmednagar.
2. Laxman s/o Umaji Borude
Age : 65 years, Occu : Agri.,
R/o. Agadgaon, Tq. Nagar,
Dist. Ahmednagar

... RESPONDENTS

Shri. Abhijeet P. Avhad, Advocate for the applicants
Shri. R. B. Bagul, APP for the respondent/State
Shri. A. G. Ambetkar, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

**CORAM : T. V. NALAWADE &
M. G. SEWLIKAR, JJ.**

DATED : 25-02-2021

ORAL JUDGMENT (PER : T. V. NALAWADE, J.) :-

1. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith, heard finally with the consent of the parties for final disposal.

2. Present proceeding is filed for relief of quashing of Crime No. 1130/2020 registered with Nagar Taluka Police Station, Tq. Nagar, District Ahmednagar for the offences punishable under Sections 327, 323, 504, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Sections 3(1)(r)(s) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act. The crime is registered on the basis of report given by respondent No. 2. During arguments learned counsels of the applicants and respondent No. 2 submitted that the parties have settled the dispute. They have some dispute of civil nature and civil suit is also pending between them. Today this Court granted relief to them in Criminal Application No. 255 of 2021. They have decided to settle the dispute and they want to live together a peaceful life.

3. In view of this circumstances, this Court hold that relief needs to be granted. Respondent No. 2 has no objection to grant such relief and such affidavit-in-reply is filed. So the application is allowed. Relief is granted in terms of prayer clause (B).

4. Rule made absolute in those terms.

[M. G. SEWLIKAR, J.]

[T. V. NALAWADE , J.]

ssp