



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1277 OF 2026

Madan Dadasaheb Toradmal And Others

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Another

...

Mr. A. S. More, Advocate for Applicants

Mr. S. K. Shirse, APP for Respondent No.1/State

Mr. K. T. Taur, Advocate for Respondent No.2

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J

DATE : MAY 07, 2026

PC :

1. The Applicants seek to quash FIR No. I-150/2010 registered with Police Station Karjat, District Ahmednagar for offences punishable under Sections 143, 147, 148, 323, 324, 326, 504 & 506 of Indian Penal Code and Section 135 of Bombay Police Act and RCC No. 67/2011 pending before JMFC, Karjat.

2. The investigation was set in motion on basis of information given by Respondent No. 2. In short it is alleged that on 28.08.2010 at about 04.30 pm, accused persons arrived in front of shop of informant. They were holding sticks and iron pipe and raised assault towards Respondent No. 2 and his brother. Both of them have suffered injuries. The aforesaid information culminated into registration of FIR. On completion of investigation, charge-sheet was filed. During course of trial, charge for offence under Section 326 of IPC was added. The trial proceeded. Meanwhile, Applicant and Respondent No. 2 arrived at an amicable settlement. The Respondent No. 2 has filed affidavit-in-reply to present Application stating that he

has no objection if FIR and consequential proceedings and criminal case bearing RCC No. 67/2011 pending before JMFC, Karjat are quashed and set aside.

3. The perusal of medical certificate and evidence of medical officer shows that simple injuries were suffered by informant and his brother. Later on x-ray report is brought on record. On 19.04.2026, learned Advocates appearing for Applicant and Respondent No. 2 jointly submitted before this Court that parties have arrived at amicable settlement. They were relegated to Registrar (Judicial) of this Court. Accordingly, Respondent No. 2 has tendered his affidavit giving no objection for quashment of FIR and consequential proceedings.

4. The record tendered before this Court does not show criminal antecedents of Applicant. The second injured/victim Popat Shamrao Gangarde is no more, however, evidence of doctor recorded during course of trial shows that he has suffered simple injury. The parties are from same village and residing in same vicinity. In result, this Court find that there is genuine and amicable settlement between parties. At this stage, 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, particularly para 31 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. In light of law laid down by Hon’ble Supreme Court in case of ***Narinder Singh*** (supra) and looking to nature of dispute and no objection given by Respondent No. 2, this Court finds that case is made out to exercise inherent powers. Hence, Application is allowed in terms of prayer clause ‘B’.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)

Umesh