

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1084 OF 2025

1. Prabanjan Madan Kavarso	]
2. Muktar Mohammad Mahboob Shaikh	]
3. Narendra Narayan Reddy	]
4. Dattatray Sonba Daundkar	] .. Applicants
Versus	
1. The State of Maharashtra	]
2. Vishakha Industries Ltd.	] .. Respondents

Ms. Rukmini Khairnar, Advocate for the Applicants.
Mrs. M.M. Deshmukh, I/c. Public Prosecutor for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Pratik Rahade, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

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

DATE : 15TH OCTOBER 2025.

Per Gautam A. Ankhad, J.

The applicants in this present criminal applications were working in the sales department of the respondent no. 2 company. On 17th April 2008, the respondent no. 2 lodged an FIR bearing CR No.179 of 2008 alleging offences of forgery, falsification of accounts and cheating. Charge-sheet was filed against the applicants and the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class II at Nashik in RCC case no. 300286 of 2009 framed charge under section 403, 420, 478 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. It is also stated an application seeking directions for further investigation was preferred by the respondent no. 2 which came to be rejected and criminal revision against the said order is pending before the learned sessions court at Nashik. In the meantime, the parties have settled their differences amicably. Hence, the present criminal application has been filed seeking *inter alia* following prayer:

“(a) By an Order of this Hon’ble Court be pleased to quash the FIR being 179/2008 registered at Panchavati Police Station for the offences punishable under Section 403, 420, 478 r/w 34 of the IPC as well as the RCC/300286/2009 pending before the Learned Judicial Magistrate First Class II, Nashik”

2. Mr Rakhade, learned advocate for the respondent no. 2 has tendered an affidavit on behalf of the respondent no. 2 dated 10th September 2025. The affidavit records that the parties have settled disputes amicably and the respondent no. 2 does not wish to continue proceedings arising out of the FIR lodged. The affidavit is taken on record and marked as “X” for identification. The petitioners and Mr. R. Rajanikanth, General Manager-Legal who are all present in Court confirm the settlement.

3. It is settled principle of law as held by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in “*Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*”, (2012) 10 SCC 303, where offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or like transactions where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and parties have resolved their dispute, the High Court may quash the proceedings. The present case involves a dispute between a company and its erstwhile employees where they have settled their issues amicably. In light of the same, the application succeeds and is allowed in terms of prayer clause (a).

[GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.]

[CHIEF JUSTICE]