



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (APL) NO. 315 OF 2025

Prashant S/o. Madhukarrao Jaodand
Aged about 55 Yrs., Occ.: Service,
R/o. Evonit Steel Limited,
Bhugaon, Tah. And District Wardha

...APPLICANT

// V E R S U S //

1. **State of Maharashtra,**
Through its Police Station
Officer, Police Station Sewagram,
Tah. and Distt. Wardha

2. **Mahendra S/o. Sadashivrao Choudhari,**
Aged : 71 Yrs., Occu.: Business,
R/o Ganesh Nagar, Wardha,
Tah. & Distt. Wardha

RESPONDENTS

Mr Tushar Tathod, Advocate for the applicant
Ms Mayuri Deshmukh, APP for respondent No. 1/State
Mr S. K. Bhoyar, Advocate for respondent No.2

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND PRAVIN S. PATIL, JJ.
DATED : MARCH 26, 2025.

ORAL JUDGMENT : (PER : ANIL S. KILOR, J.)

1. Heard.

2. **RULE.** Rule made returnable forthwith. Taken up for final disposal with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.

3. The present application has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure ("Cr.P.C.", for short) for quashing the FIR No.100/2008 for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467 and 471 r/w Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code ("IPC", for short), registered with Sevagram Police Station, District Wardha, and the chargesheet that came to be filed vide Chargesheet No.9/2019 dated 22-01-2019 pending before the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Wardha.

4. After the notice was issued to respondent No.2 i.e. the original informant, he appeared and filed reply. Wherein it is stated that, during the course of investigation, the accused approached the respondent No.2 and after due negotiations, the grievance in the FIR lodged by him has been solved. The accused has compensated him. Therefore, in view of the amicable settlement, he has no objection for quashing the FIR and the proceedings.

5. Heard learned Advocate for the applicant and learned APP for the respondent No.1. Learned Advocate for respondent No.2 reiterates the fact that there is a settlement between the parties.

6. Perusal of the FIR and the other documents on record would show that the dispute arose in respect of the immovable property and mutation entry. The mutation entries were not carried out by the Revenue Officers and then it had led to the transactions in the nature of sale. Now the informant says that he has been adequately compensated. We have no hesitation in allowing the application by exercising our inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We, therefore, proceed to pass the following order :

- (a) Application stands allowed and disposed of.
- (b) FIR vide Crime No.100/2008 dated 02-07-2008 and Chargesheet No.9/2019 dated 22-01-2019, pending before the learned JMFC, Wardha, for the offence

punishable under Sections 420, 467, 471 read with Section 34 of the IPC against the applicant, stands quashed and set aside.

- (c) For utilizing the Police machinery, the applicant is directed to deposit costs of Rs. 25,000/- to be deposited on or before 30-04-2025.

Rule Accordingly.

[PRAVIN S. PATIL, J]

[ANIL S. KILOR, J.]

Namrata