

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 655 OF 2026

Bhausahab Baban Hole

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Another

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Ingole Dhanraj S.

APP for Respondent/State : Mr. S.N. Kendre

Advocate for Respondent No.2 : Mr. Patil Vrishab Mahendra

...

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.

DATED : MARCH 26, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Present application is filed with following prayers :

“B) That, the first information report bearing Crime No. 0789 of 2023 registered with Shrigonda Police Station, District Ahmednagar for offences under Section 324, 323, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code and section 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(va) of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act may kindly be quashed and set aside.

C) That, proceedings in proceedings bearing Special Case No. 136 of 2023 pending before Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Shrigonda District, Ahmednagar in Crime No. 0789 of 2023 registered with Shrigonda Police Station, District Ahmednagar for offences under Section 324, 323, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code and section 3(1)(r) 3(1)(s) 3(2)(va) of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act may kindly be quashed and set aside.”

2. The investigation was set in motion on the basis of information given by respondent no.2 alleging that he belongs to scheduled caste category and undertakes work of cleaning toilets in hospital. On 11.09.2023, he demanded dues of Rs.18,000/- towards

his work from applicant. The applicant abused him and inflicted injury by hard and blunt substance above his left eye brow and abused him on caste. The aforesaid information culminated into registration of FIR No.789 of 2023 for offences punishable under Section 323, 324, 504, 506 of Indian Penal Code and Section 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act ('S.C. and S.T. Act' for short). The investigation progressed and charge sheet has been filed. At present, Special Case No.136 of 2023 is pending before Sessions Court at Shrigonda, District Ahmednagar.

3. Today, learned advocates appearing for applicant and respondent no.2 jointly submit that parties have amicably settled dispute. The parties have filed terms of settlement which are duly verified by them wherein respondent no.2 has stated that he did not want to proceed with matter and wants to put an end to litigation against applicant. It is stated that by intervention of respectable persons, they have amicably settled dispute. **The respondent no.2 has also filed an undertaking that amount of Rs.50,000/- received by him by way of monetary relief as contemplated under Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Rules, 1995 shall be refunded by him.** Learned advocate appearing for respondent no.2, on instructions, submits that amount would be refunded within a period

of two weeks from today. The undertaking filed by respondent is taken on record and marked as 'X' for identification.

4. Perusal of medical record shows that respondent has suffered simple injuries. No weapon was recovered in pursuance to allegations in FIR. In that view of matter, reference can be given to observations of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of ***Narinder Singh and Others Vs. State of Punjab and another*** reported in ***(2014) 6 SCC 466***, which 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.”

5. This Court finds that applicant and respondent no.2 have genuinely settled personal dispute. Dragging them to trial would be wastage of judicial time. No purpose would be served by continuing the trial. The dispute is apparently personal in nature. The respondent no.2 has filed affidavit that he has no interest to prosecute criminal trial against applicant.

6. In that view of matter, criminal application is allowed in terms of prayer clause (B) and (C), subject to refund of Rs.50,000/- by respondent no.2.

(4)

7. Place the matter for recording compliance as to refund of amount after three weeks.

(S.G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)

Mujaheed//