

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CR. WRIT PETITION NO. 320 OF 2026

Sachin Ramesh Bhandare

... Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra And Anr.

... Respondents

Mr. Viraj V. Nalawade a/w. Mr. Girish Mujumdar, Ms. Sharvari Tipugade & Mr. Sandeep Magar for the Petitioner.

Mrs. Priyanka S. Rane, A.P.P. for the Respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Irshad M. Malik a/w. Mr. Shivam Walekar for the Respondent No.2.

Coram : RANJITSINHA RAJA BHONSALE, J.

Date : 17th April 2026.

PER COURT :

1. Heard learned advocates for the parties.
2. The Petitioner has filed the present Petition under Article 226 & 227 of the Constitution of India and Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking quashing of the FIR bearing No. 0081 of 2026, dated 23rd February 2026, registered with the Akulj Police Station, Solapur Rural, for the offences punishable under Section 64(1) & 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, "B.N.S.").

3. Learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner and the Respondent No. 2 have amicably settled and resolved the disputes and differences between them.
4. Learned Advocate for the Respondent No.2 submits that the Respondent No.2 has filed the consent Affidavit dated 17th April 2026 duly signed by the Notary public.
5. The Respondent No.2 is present in the Court and she has been identified by her Advocate. The Respondent No. 2 reiterates the contents of the Affidavit dated 17th April 2026. Learned Advocate for the Respondent No.2 submitted duly verified copy of the Aadhar Card of the Respondent No.2. The same is attached to the consent Affidavit.
6. A perusal of the consent Affidavit indicates that Respondent No. 2 and the Petitioner were known to each other, as Respondent No. 2 had been working at the Petitioner's residence as a domestic servant for the past eight years. It further appears that personal relations developed between the Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 voluntarily and with consent. It is stated that, in December 2025, certain disputes and quarrels arose between Respondent No. 2 and the Petitioner and his family, as a result of which they were no longer on speaking terms, and Respondent No. 2 left the employment at the Petitioner's residence.
7. Respondent No. 2, in paragraph 4 of the affidavit, has specifically

referred to the incident in respect of which the F.I.R. has been lodged. She has stated that, though the incident has taken place and the contents of the F.I.R. are true, in view of the past relations and the settlement between the parties, she has pardoned the accused and that all disputes, differences, and grievances between the parties have been amicably resolved.

8. In paragraph 6 of the consent Affidavit, Respondent No. 2 has further stated that she does not wish to pursue the allegations in the F.I.R. and has given her 'no objection' for quashing of the F.I.R. and for compounding the matter.

9. The scope of the High Court's inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has been authoritatively expounded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Narinder Singh V/s. State of Punjab*, reported in (2014) 6 SCC 466. The Hon'ble Supreme Court categorically held that the High Court's power to quash criminal proceedings under Section 482 is independent of, and distinct from, the power of a criminal Court to compound offences under Section 320 of the Code. Consequently, even in cases involving non-compoundable offences, this Court is vested with the inherent jurisdiction to quash proceedings where the parties have arrived at a genuine settlement. While this extraordinary power must not be invoked in prosecutions involving heinous crimes, offences of mental depravity, or wrongs against society at large, it is squarely applicable to cases where the

wrong is basically private or personal in nature. The ultimate touchstone for exercising this power is twofold: to secure the ends of justice and to prevent the abuse of the process of any Court.

10. Applying these guiding principles to the present case, the offences alleged are private in nature and do not have any wider societal impact. The parties have amicably resolved all their disputes and differences out of their own free will and volition, leaving no surviving grievance against each other. In view of the amicable settlement, the possibility of a conviction is bleak, and permitting the prosecution to continue would be a futile exercise amounting to an abuse of the process of law. Therefore, to secure the ends of justice and to promote harmony, this Court finds it appropriate to accept the compromise and quash the FIR along with all consequent proceedings.

11. In view of the above and as the matter is amicably settled between the parties, I am inclined to quash the FIR bearing No. 0081 of 2026, dated 23rd February 2026, registered with the Akulj Police Station, Solapur Rural, for the offences punishable under Section 64(1) & 351(2) of the B.N.S..

12. As I have expressed my opinion for quashing of the aforesaid crime in question, learned Advocate for the Petitioner, on instructions, submitted that, for quashing of the said crime the Petitioner will pay a cost of Rs. 35,000/-. The said statement is accepted as an undertaking given to this Court.

13. Learned Advocate for the Respondent No. 2, on instructions, submitted that, as Respondent No. 2 is successful in settlement of the matter, due to lodgment of present crime, Respondent No. 2 will also voluntarily pay a cost of Rs. 35,000/-. The said statement is accepted as an undertaking given to this Court.

14. The learned A.P.P. submits that, as the Petitioner and Respondent No.2 have utilized the police machinery for resolving their disputes and grievances, the costs imposed may be directed to be utilized towards the purchase of necessary equipment, stationery items/articles, and/or library books, as well as for obtaining a subscription to SCC Online for the Office of the Public Prosecutor, High Court of Bombay, Circuit Bench at Kolhapur. Learned Advocate for the Petitioner and learned Advocate for the Respondent No.2 have no objection for the same.

15. In view thereof, the In-charge of the Office of the Public Prosecutor shall furnish a list of necessary items/articles, along with an estimate obtained from a reputed shop / vendor, to the learned Advocate for the Petitioner and the learned Advocate for Respondent No. 2, for the amount of Rs. 35,000/- each. This be done on or before 29th April 2026.

16. In view of the above and subject to payment of cost directly to the vendor against payment as stated above by the Petitioner and the Respondent No. 2, within stipulated period as noted above, the Petition is allowed in

terms of prayer clause (b).

17. It is made clear that, if the said cost is not paid within stipulated period as mentioned above, the Petition shall stand revived automatically and in that event, the Investigating Officer will proceed with the investigation of the said F.I.R. expeditiously.

18. List the Petition on board on 30th April 2026, under the caption “For Reporting Compliance”.

19. All the concerned to act on authenticated copy of this Order.

[RANJITSINHA RAJA BHONSALE, J.]

OMKAR
SHIVAHAR
KUMBHAKARN

Digitally signed
by OMKAR
SHIVAHAR
KUMBHAKARN
Date:
2026.04.24
19:31:22 +0530