



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

950 CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 2540 OF 2025

1. Swaraj Suresh Tandale (Husband)
Age: 31 years, Occ: Advocate,
2. Suresh Ghanshyam Tandale (Father-in-law)
Age: 62 years, Occ: Retired,
3. Vijaya Suresh Tandale (Mother-in-law)
Age: 53 years, Occ: Household

All R/o: Plot No.271, N-3, Near Jain Temple,
Cidco, Dist. Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar.

Applicants

VERSUS

1. The State Of Maharashtra
Through Investigation Officer,
Beed City Police Station, Beed.
2. Rutuja d/o Vijay Hange
Age: 30 years, Occ: Nil
R/o: Punyai Niwas, Near Vivekanand
Hospital, Jalna Road, Beed- 431122

Respondents.

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Amol P. Gaikwad h/f S.E. Shekade

APP for Respondents: Mr. S.P. Joshi

Advocate for Respondent 2 : Mr. A.T. Jadhavar

...

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.

Dated : April 17, 2026

FINAL ORDER :-

1. Learned counsel appearing for applicants seeks leave to add the prayer. Leave granted. Addition be carried out forthwith.

2. The applicants seeks to quash the FIR No.56 of 2025 dated 11.4.2025 registered with police station Beed City for the offences punishable under Sections 85, 115(2), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023.

3. On 30.7.2025 notice was issued to the respondents on statement made on behalf of the applicants that applicant no.1 is ready for mediation.

4. Respondent no.2 has appeared before this Court through advocate.

5. Today, learned advocates appearing for the parties filed on record compromise deed/affidavit, whereby it is brought on record that parties have amicably settled the dispute. A petition No.155 of 2025 is filed by them seeking divorce by mutual consent before the Family Court, Aurangabad. They have filed a compromise deed on record of the family Court, whereby they have stipulated terms of settlement.

6. It appears that parties have amicably settled the terms as regards to permanent alimony to be paid to respondent no.2, visitation rights in respect of child and all other matters related to exchange of jewelry etc. Respondent no.2 has agreed to give no objection for quashing of the FIR and consequential

proceeding before passing decree of divorce by mutual consent. Similarly, compromise-deed is presented before this Court, which is duly signed by parties, their advocates. Respondent no.2 is personally present before this Court, she accepts terms of compromise to be true and correct. Compromise deed is taken on record and marked as exhibit X for identification.

7. Aforesaid sequence of events depicts that parties have genuinely settled their matrimonial dispute. The respondent no.2 has voluntarily consented for quashing of FIR and consequential proceeding in R.C.C. No.591 of 2025.

8. In light of aforesaid factual backdrop, taking into account exposition of law by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another** reported in (2014) SCC 466, particularly, paragraph no.31 which lays guideline for quashing of criminal proceeding that reads thus :-

“31.Where criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationships or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves. The possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to

great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.”

9. This Court finds that in light of aforesaid exposition of law, case is made out to exercise inherent powers and grant the prayers as made in this application. Hence, application is allowed in terms of prayer clause **B** and **B-A & B-B** and **disposed of**.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)

...

AAA/f