

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.3678 OF 2023**

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. | Dhiraj R. Charne | |
| 2. | Yashoda R. Charne | |
| 3. | Rupali A. Shinde | |
| 4. | Sonali B. Bhosale | |
| 5. | Arun G. Shinde | ...Petitioners |
| | Versus | |
| 1. | State of Maharashtra | |
| 2. | Sushma Kalyani Dhiraj Charne | ...Respondents |

Mr. Aditya Raktade for the Petitioners.
Mr. S.V. Gavand, APP for the Respondent/State.
Mr. Sumit Vhanbhatte for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE &
N. R. BORKAR, JJ.
DATE : 7 NOVEMBER, 2023.**

PC:-

1. The present petition under Articles 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is filed to quash the First Information Report No.687 of 2021 dated 10 December 2021 registered at Vadgaon Police Station, Kolhapur for the offences punishable under Section 498-A, 324, 504 and 506 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
2. The aforesaid crime came to be registered against the petitioners at the instance of respondent No.2/complainant. The allegations against the petitioners, who are husband and in-laws of respondent No. 2 are *inter alia* of cruelty.

3. The quashing of FIR is sought on the ground that there has been an amicable settlement between the parties and respondent No.2 is no longer desirous of prosecuting the case in question.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners and respondent No.2 jointly submit that the parties have amicably settled their matrimonial dispute. It is submitted that no purpose would be served by keeping the prosecution alive, in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties. It is submitted that the present case is squarely covered by the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Anr.***¹.

5. The respondent No.2, who is identified by her Advocate Mr. Sumit Vhanbhatte, is personally present in the Court. She confirms about the settlement arrived at with the petitioners and the contents of the affidavit dated 7 November 2023 filed by her, wherein she has stated that she has no objection if the criminal case in question against the petitioners is quashed.

6. The statement that the amount of Rs. 3,50,000/- would be paid to the respondent No. 2 as per consent terms is accepted as undertaking to this Court.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Gian Singh*

1 (2012) 10 SCC 303

(*supra*) has held :

“But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on a 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, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put the 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.”

8. The main reason for filing of FIR by respondent No.2 appears to be matrimonial discord. The allegations are totally personal in nature. Even otherwise in view of the settlement between the parties, the respondent No.2 is not going to support the prosecution case. Thus, nothing fruitful will come out of the prosecution in question. Considering overall facts and circumstances, in our view, the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the Petition is allowed in terms of prayer clause (a).

9. The Petition is disposed of.

(N.R. BORKAR, J.)

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)