

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.828 OF 2025

Meghnath Lingappa Patil,]
R/o. Bhopale Building, Rajarampuri,]
Kolhapur, Maharashtra] .. Applicant

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,]
Through Sanpada Police Station]
2. Victim XYZ,]
Through Sanpada Police Station] .. Respondents

Mr. Raviraj R. Parmane, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. J.P. Yagnik, Additional Public Prosecutor for Respondent No.1-State of Maharashtra.

Smt. Nishi Singhvi, i/by Mr. Om Latpate, Advocates for Respondent No.2.

PSI Suraj Shivaji Raut, Sanpada Police Station, Navi Mumbai is present in Court.

**CORAM : SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR, CJ. &
GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.**

DATE : 13TH OCTOBER 2025.

Per Gautam A. Ankhad, J.

A First Information Report bearing Crime No.88 of 2025 was registered on 3rd May 2025 at the instance of the respondent no.2 under section 69 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 with Sanpada Police Station, Navi Mumbai. The applicant was arrested by the police and later released on bail. After his release from jail, the applicant and the respondent no.2 have amicably settled their dispute by taking recourse of mediation. Hence, the present criminal application is filed seeking *inter alia* following prayers:-

*“a. That this Hon'ble Court be pleased to quash the
impugned FIR in CR No.88/2025 dated 16.03.2024*

for the offences u/s 69 of BNS Act registered with Sanpada Police Station, Navi Mumbai in respect of present Applicant.”

3. Smt. Singhvi, learned Advocate for the respondent no.2 has tendered an affidavit dated 13th October 2025 of the respondent no.2 across the bar. The affidavit records that the FIR was lodged due to misunderstandings between the parties and reiterated that the parties have settled the matter amicably. The said Affidavit is taken on record and marked “X” for identification.

4. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of “*B.S. Joshi v. State of Haryana*”, (2003) 4 SCC 675 has upheld the powers of the High Court under Section 482 to quash criminal proceedings where dispute is of a private nature and a compromise is entered into between the parties who have settled their differences. We are satisfied that the present dispute between parties has been settled amicably and the continuation of such proceedings would be a futile exercise. Hence, Criminal Application No.828 of 2025 is allowed in terms of prayer clause (a).

[GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.]

[CHIEF JUSTICE]