

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6885 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-141 Year-2021 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Patna

-
-
1. Manindra Nath Pandey Son of Late Babu Ram Pandey R/O Mohalla- Shiv Nagar Colony, West Of Beur Jail, P.S.- Beur, P.O.- Anisabad, Distt.- Patna- 800002
 2. Renu Pandey Wife of Sri Mahindra Nath Pandey R/O Mohalla- Shiv Nagar Colony, West Of Beur Jail, P.S.- Beur, P.O.- Anisabad, Distt.- Patna- 800002
- Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
 2. Sonam Raj D/O- Umesh Trivedi, Wife Of Manish Ranjan R/O Mohalla- Shiv Sagar Colony, West Of Beur Jail, P.S.- Beur, P.O.- Anisabad, Distt.- Patna- 800002
- Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Kuber Pathak, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Suman Kumari Singh, A.P.P
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Vinod Pandey, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

5 27-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned A.P.P for the State and learned counsel appearing for the Opposite Party No.2.

2. This is an application on behalf of the petitioners for quashing the entire prosecution arising out of Mahila P.S. Case No. 141 of 2021 dated 02.12.2021, District-Patna, for offences under Section 498A/34 of the I.P.C and 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act which is pending in the learned court of Judicial Magistrate-1st Class, Patna.

3. The petitioners in the present application are the father-in-law and mother-in-law of the opposite party no.2 and the allegations against them made in the First Information Report are general and omnibus in nature with no specific allegations being



imputed on them. The further development in this case is that the parties to the litigation have settled the disputes amicably between them in course of the mediation proceeding at Patna High Court Mediation Centre by way of a memorandum of agreement dated 19.09.2023 passed in Mediation Proceeding No.576 of 2023 where they agreed to come to a one time settlement of parting ways as they decided to live separately in future by getting their matrimonial relations dissolved by a decree of divorce on the agreed terms and conditions. A supplementary affidavit has been filed on behalf of the petitioners highlighting the factum of one time settlement and the copy of the judgment dated 09.05.2025 dissolving the marriage between the parties under Section 13B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 and the decree of divorce dated 22.05.2025 have also been brought on record by way of Annexure-P/3 to the supplementary affidavit.

4. At this juncture this Court would gainfully refer to the case of **Kahkashan Kausar vs. State of Bihar**, reported in (2022) 6 SCC 599, where the Hon'ble Supreme Court has guarded against over-implication of family members of husband of informant and has even noted that even eventual acquittal also inflicts severe scars on the accused.

5. Besides considering the fact that the petitioners happen to be the in-laws of the opposite party no.2, also considering the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in



the case of **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab**, reported in (2012) 10 SCC 303, holding that the High Court within the framework of inherent power, may quash the criminal proceedings, if it is satisfied that on the face of such settlement, there is hardly any likelihood of the offender being convicted and by not quashing criminal proceedings, justice shall be casualty and the ends of justice shall be defeated.

6. In the case of **Naushey Ali v. State of U.P.**, reported in (2025) 4 SCC 78, there is a clear cut observation by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that when the parties have amicably resolved the dispute, proceeding with the trial would be an exercise in futility and the ends of justice require that the settlement be given effect to by quashing the proceedings.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab**, reported in (2014) 6 SCC 466, has reiterated the position that criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly, those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire dispute among themselves.

8. Thus, in view of the amicable settlement having been reached between the parties after the process of mediation in the form of a decree of divorce passed on mutual consent, a quietus ought to be given to the criminal proceedings as the continuation



of the same, especially against the family members of the husband of the opposite party no.2, especially in absence of any specific allegations, would serve no legitimate purpose as has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Mange Ram Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh & Anr. (2025 INSC 962)** and would only prolonged bitterness between the parties and unnecessarily burden the judicial system, especially when the disputes are no longer live.

9. Accordingly, considering it to be the bounden duty of this Court to secure the ends of justice which can be done only by drawing down the curtains to the litigation between the parties in view of the settlement reached between them, this Court in its inherent jurisdiction of Section 482 Cr.P.C., would proceed to quash the criminal prosecution arising out of Mahila P.S. Case No. 141 of 2021 dated 02.12.2021 as the continuance of the same would only amount to abuse of the process of the Court.

10. Accordingly, the criminal prosecution arising out of Mahila P.S. Case No.141 of 2021 dated 02.12.2021 stands quashed and the instant application is allowed.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Anand/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

