



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 693 OF 2026

1. Hanmallu Balanna Satalwar
Age: 52 years, Occu.: Service as a Teacher
 2. Shanta Hanmulla Satalwar
Age: 47 years, Occu.: Household
 3. Seema Hanmulla Satalwar
Age: 32 years, Occu.: Teacher
 4. Shubham Hanmulla Satalwar
Age: 18 years, Occu.: Education
Applicant no. 1, 2 and 4 R/o Hottel,
Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded.
At present Dist. Chh. Sambhajinagar
 5. Ashok Sayalu Wankalwar
Age: 44 years, Occu.: Agri
 6. Prabhu Ramalu Wankalwar
Age: 40 years, Occu.: Agri
 7. Balaji Ramalu Wankalwar
Age: 38 years, Occu.: Agri
 8. Sayalu Parmeshu Wankalwar
Age: 77 years, Occu.: Agri
Applicant no. 3, 5 to 8 are R/o Hottel
Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded.
- ..Applicants

VERSUS

1. The State Of Maharashtra
Through Police Station, Degloor,
Dist. Nanded.
 2. Sulochana Sudhakar Bandewad
Age: 50 years, Occu.: Household,
R/o. Tamloor, Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
- ..Respondents

WITH**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1734 OF 2025**

1. Shubham Sudhakar Bandewad
Age: 29 years, Occ.: Service(ClarK in MSRTC)
R/o. Tamloor, Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
2. Shivling Shankarrao Margapwar
Age.: 47 years, Occu.: Service
(ZP School Malwati, Tq. and Dist. Latur)
R/o. Tamloor, Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
3. Shankar Balajirao Margapwar
Age: 74 years, Occ.: Agriculture,
R/o. Tamloor, Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
4. Sulochana Sudhakar Bandewad
Age: 50 years, Occu.: Household,
R/o. Tamloor, Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
5. Sawitri Shankarrao Margapwar
Age: 62 years, Occu.: Household
R/o. Tamloor, Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
6. Sanjay Ramrao Naikwade
Age: 52 years, Occu.: Service
(Teacher in ZP School, Kudli, Tq. Degloor)
R/o. Hamnegaon, Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
7. Pornima Sanjay Naikwade
Age: 46 years, Occu.: Household
R/o. Hanegaon, Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
8. Pranita Vitthal Barale,
Age: 32 years, Occu.: Household
R/o. Bhaygaon Road, Degloor,
Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
9. Vitthal Ramrao Barale
Age: 42 years, Occu.: Labor
R/o. Bhaygaon Road, Degloor,

Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
VERSUS

..Petitioners

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through Police Station, Markhel,
Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded
2. Hanmallu Balanna Satalwar
Age: 51 years, Occu.: Service as a Teacher,
R/o. Hottal, Tq. Degloor, Dist. Nanded ..Respondents

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mrs S.G. Chincholkar
APP for Respondents: Mr. S. D. Ghayal
Advocate for Respondent 2 : Mr. U. B. Deshmukh

...

CORAM :S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.
Dated: 9th April, 2026

FINAL ORDER:-

1. Criminal writ petition no.1734 of 2025 impugns the FIR no.77 of 2025 dated 21.3.2025 registered with Police Station Markhel for offences punishable under sections 318(2), 318(3), 296, 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 and section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961. The petitioners further seeks quashment of the consequential proceeding in RCC No.226 of 2025 pending before the J.M.F.C. Degloor.
2. Criminal application no.693 of 2026 impugns the FIR no.101 of 2025 dated 22.2.2025 registered with Police Station Degloor for offences punishable under section 189(2), 191(2), 190, 333, 296, 115(2), 352,

351(2) of the BNS, 2023 and consequential proceeding in RCC No.87 of 2025.

3, Since the FIR in both matters are arising out of same incident and in the nature of counter complaints to each other, both the matters are taken together for disposal.

3. On 6.3.2026 learned advocates appearing for the respective parties submit before this Court that parties are willing to explore the possibility of amicable settlement through expert mediation. Eventually, Mr. R.G. Godbole, learned advocate was appointed to mediate between the parties and submit report of mediation to this Court.

4. Mr. Godbole, learned advocate(Mediator) has submitted his report dated 18.3.2026 alongwith terms of settlement duly signed by the parties, whereby they agreed unconditionally to withdraw the allegations made against each others and decided to not to proceed in furtherance with the FIR registered against each other. The report of mediation is taken on record and marked as Exhibit "X".

5. Perusal of the FIR in both the cases suggests that proposal for marriage between the two families could not have fructified although, talks in this regard were advanced. However, at last stage bride withdrawn her consent. The incident in question took place when both

the families were under shock. However by expert mediation, they have settled the dispute and unconditionally withdrawn allegations made in respective FIR's.

6. In light of the successful mediation and terms of settlement signed by informants in respective matters, this Court finds that case is made out to exercise inherent powers in light of observations of Supreme Court in case of **Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another reported in (2014) SCC 466**, which states as under:-

“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.”

7. Criminal Application no.693 of 2026 is allowed in terms of prayer clause ‘b’ and Writ Petition no. 1734 of 2025 is allowed in terms of prayer clause ‘B’ and **disposed of**.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)

...