



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 2991 OF 2025

SUSHIL YUVRAJ HARALE

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Mr. P. H. Patil h/f Gajanan G. Gabhud, Advocate for Applicant.

Mr. S. A. Gaikwad, APP for Respondents-State.

Mr. Mukund D. Gitte, Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 and 3.

...

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.

DATED : 13th FEBRUARY, 2026.

P.C.:-

1. The applicant seeks quashment of FIR dated 30.04.2025 in Crime No.272/2025 registered with M.I.D.C. CIDCO Police Station, Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar for offences punishable under Sections 281, 125(a), 125(b) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 134 of Motor Vehicle Act and consequential proceeding in S.C.C. No.29405/2025, pending before Judicial Magistrate First Class, Aurangabad. The applicant also raises challenge to order dated 08.01.2026 passed by Judicial Magistrate First Class, Aurangabad, thereby taking cognizance on police report against applicant.

2. The investigation was set in motion on the basis of information given by respondent no.2 alleging that on 29.04.2025 while his grandmother and her tenant were passing from Savitrinagar to Chikalthana road, four wheeler bearing

Registration No.MH-20-GC-5209 driven by applicant gave forceful dash to them and ran away from spot. Due to impact of accident, grandmother suffered injuries. She was shifted to hospital for further medical treatment. The aforesaid information culminated into registration of Crime No.272/2025 for charged offences. The investigation progressed and charge-sheet has been filed against applicant. Eventually, S.C.C. No.29405/2025 is registered and pending trial before Judicial Magistrate First Class at Aurangabad.

3. On 12.08.2025, learned Advocates for respective parties jointly submitted that applicant and victim have arrived at amicable settlement. The applicant was directed to add victim as party respondent. Accordingly amendment is carried and victim is added as respondent no.3. The applicant, respondent no.2 and respondent no.3 appeared before Registrar (Judicial) of this Court and tendered terms of settlement. They have signed terms of settlement. They were identified by their Advocates. They admit that contents of settlement terms are true and correct, and that they have voluntarily entered into compromise without any force, coercion or fraud.

4. Perusal of compromise terms shows that respondent no.3 is adequately compensated for injuries suffered by her. She has received Rs.1,50,000/- for future medical treatment. She asserted

that she would not file any claim for compensation against applicant and vehicle owner before Competent Court. The respondent nos.2 and 3 conveyed their no objection for quashing FIR and consequential proceeding registered against applicant.

5. The aforesaid terms of compromise shows that there is genuine settlement between parties. The attributions in FIR are personal in nature. The respondent no.2/informant and respondent no.3/victim of accident do not wish to proceed further with prosecution and amicably settled dispute with applicant.

6. In light of aforesaid factual aspects of matter, reference can be given to observations of Supreme Court in case of ***Narinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab and Ors.***¹, wherein following observations are made:

“where 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 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.”

7. In light of aforesaid exposition of law, if factual matrix in present case is considered, the offence pertains to personal loss of victim. She is adequately compensated, hence, case is made out to

¹ (2014) 6 SCC 466.

quash and set aside FIR and consequential proceeding, as no purpose would be served by continuing prosecution.

8. In result, Criminal Application is allowed in terms of prayer Clauses (B) and (B-1).

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR)
JUDGE

Devendra/February-2026