

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

33 CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.2479 OF 2019

SITABAI W/O. SUDAM AVHAD AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANR

...

Advocate for Applicants : Ms. Jagtap Gitanjali R.
APP for Respondents: Mr. S J Salgare
Advocate for Respondent 2 : Mr. Shekade S E
(appointed)

...

CORAM : V.K. JADHAV & SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, JJ.
Dated: November 29, 2021

...

PER COURT :-

1. The applicants/original accused are seeking quashing of the FIR I-56 of 2019 registered with Amalner Police Station, Beed District Beed for the offence punishable under sections 498-A, 323, 504, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and also seeking quashing of the Criminal Proceedings vide RCC No 212 of 2019 pending before the Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Ashti, on settlement.

2. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the parties have arrived at amicable settlement and, accordingly, the terms of the compromise are also

aaa/-

worked out. Learned counsel submits that, in terms of the compromise, parties have decided to settle their dispute permanently and now they are ready and willing to reside together. The compromise terms are annexed to this application signed by all the parties.

3. Learned counsel for respondent no.2/informant submits that due to efforts made by the friends and elders as well as respectable people of the society, parties have arrived at amicable settlement. Respondent no.2 has agreed to withdraw the complaint made against the applicants. They have decided to settle their disputes finally and there is no ill will or the complaint against each other in any manner. Learned counsel for respondent no.2 submits that respondent no.2 is ready to go with husband at her matrimonial house and applicant no.3 Arjun Avhad is ready to take her to his house for further cohabitation. Further they have settled their dispute without any condition.

4. We have also heard the learned APP for respondent State.

aaa/-

5. We have carefully gone through the compromise terms. It appears that due to the efforts made by the friends, elder persons of the family and respectable people of the society, parties have arrived at amicable settlement and in terms of the said settlement, they have decided to reunite and live their life peacefully in the company of each other. We are satisfied that the parties have arrived at settlement, voluntarily.

6. In the case of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and others***, reported in ***(2012) 10 SCC 303***, the Supreme Court in para 48 has quoted para 21 of the judgment of the five-Judge Bench of the Punjab and Haryana High Court delivered in ***Kulwinder Singh v. State of Punjab (2007) 4 CTC 769***. A five-Judge Bench of the Punjab and Haryana High Court, in para 21 of the judgment, by placing reliance on the various judgments of the Supreme court, has framed the guidelines for quashing of the criminal proceeding on the ground of settlement. Para 21 of the said case of ***Kulwinder Singh's judgment*** is reproduced by the Supreme Court in para 48 of the

aaa/-

judgment in ***Gian Singh***. Clause 21(a) which is relevant for the present discussion reads as under :

“21. (a) Cases arising from matrimonial discord, even if other offences are introduced for aggravation of the case.”

The Supreme Court in paragraph no.61 of the judgment of *Gian Singh* (supra) has made following observations :-

“61. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under [Section 320](#) of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or F.I.R may be exercised where the offender and victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on society. Similarly, any

compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like [Prevention of Corruption Act](#) or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity etc; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.

7. In view of the above discussion and in terms of the ratio laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of Gian Singh (supra), we proceed to pass the following order.

O R D E R

- i. Criminal application is hereby allowed in terms of prayer clause '**B**' and '**BB**'.
- ii. Criminal application accordingly disposed off.

(**SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.) (V.K. JADHAV, J.)**

...