



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

913 CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 2838 OF 2025

MAYUR MADHUKAR MORE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Mr. J. V. Patil, Advocate for Applicants
Mr. S. A. Gaikwad, APP for Respondent/State
Mr. B. S. Dhawale, Advocate for Respondent No.2

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.

DATED : 23rd JANUARY, 2026

P C. :-

1. By this application, Applicants seek quashment of FIR in Crime No. 506 of 2023 registered with Bazar Peth Police Station, Bhusawal, District Jalgaon for offence punishable under Section 324 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code. Applicants further seek quashment of charge-sheet and further proceeding pending before Judicial Magistrate First Class, Bhusawal in R.C.C. No. 182 of 2024 for offences punishable under Sections 326, 324 and 323 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code.

2. The investigation was set in motion on the basis of information dated 19.10.2023 given by Respondent No.2. It is alleged that on 01.10.2023, accused persons assaulted Respondent No.2 using baseball bat and wooden

sticks as such he suffered injuries on head and other parts of body. Apparently, FIR has been lodged after 19 days of incident. Eventually, Crime No. 506 of 2023 was registered with Bazar Peth Police Station, Bhusawal. On completion of investigation, charge-sheet is filed in the Court of Judicial Magistrate First Class, Bhusawal.

3. Respondent No.2 is personally present before this Court. He filed affidavit-in-reply and accepts contents to be true and correct. He has no objection for quashment of FIR and further proceeding. It is stated that, Applicant No.1 is brother-in-law, Applicant No.2 is sister-in-law and Applicant No.3 is son of Applicant No.2 and Applicant No.4 is sister-in-law of Respondent No.2. Since parties are members a family, they have amicably settled dispute, accordingly this Court is persuaded to quash FIR and consequential proceedings.

4. Having considered contents of FIR, material collected during the course of investigation, it is evident that, parties had a family dispute. Although Respondent No.2 alleged to have suffered injuries, there is no supporting medical record from Government Hospital. Now Respondent No.2 has amicably settled dispute with Applicants so as to maintain harmony in the family.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, looking to the law laid down by Supreme Court in case of *Narinder Singh & others vs. State Punjab and another* reported in (2014) SCC 466, and factual aspects discussed above, this Court finds that case is made out for exercise of inherent powers to quash criminal proceeding, particularly when there are no chances of conviction.

6. Learned APP submits that since police machinery was exerted in filing of charge-sheet, some costs needs to be imposed. There appears substance in contention of learned APP, hence Applicants shall pay costs of Rs.10,000/- to the Government Cancer Hospital, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar within a period of four weeks from today and report compliance.

7. In view of this, Application is allowed in terms of prayer clauses 'B' and 'B-i', subject to payment of costs as indicated above.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)

ssp