



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (APL) NO. 387 OF 2026

1. Ravi s/o Lalchand Sawlani, Age 36 years, Occupation- Business,
2. Laxmi w/o Lalchand Sawlani, Original Acc No 2 Age 63 years, Occupation-Housewife,
3. Lalchand s/o Jethanand Sawlani, (Name Wrongly mentioned as Lalchand s/o Nanakram Sawlani in chargesheet) Age 65 years, Occupation-Business,
4. Deepak s/o Lalchand Sawlani, Age 40 years, Occupation- Business,
5. Himani w/o Deepak Sawlani, Age 37 years, Occupation- Housewife,
6. Suman d/o Lalchand Sawlani, Age 34 years, Occupation- Housewife

APPLICANTS

All 1 to 6 above residents of Block No.209, Near Swami Chanduram Mandir, Jaripatka, Nagpur

// VERSUS //

1. State of Maharashtra through Police Sub Inspector, Police Station Jaripatka, Nagpur
2. Suhani @ Roshni w/o Ravi Sawlani, Age 36 years, Occ- Teacher, R/o Plot No 394, Near Nanki Darbar, Jaripatka, Nagpur

NON-APPLICANTS

Mr. A.B. Deshpande, Advocate for the applicants.
Mr. Nikhil Joshi, APP for non-applicant No.1 /State.
Ms Aarti Y. Singh, Advocate for non-applicant No.2.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI PHALKE, J.

DATED : 17.03.2026

ORAL JUDGMENT :

1. Heard.
2. **ADMIT.** Taken up for final disposal with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.
3. The present application is preferred by the applicants for quashing of the First Information Report in connection with crime No.599/2022 registered at Police Station Jaripatka District Nagpur for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 323, 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and consequent proceeding arising out of the same bearing RCC No.1370/2023 pending before the learned 2nd Joint Civil Judge, Junior Division and Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nagpur.
4. During pendency of this application both parties arrived at settlement. The settlement terms are filed on record. The terms of the settlement are verified from the applicants as well as non-applicant No.2. They agreed and accepted the same.

5. As observed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh vs State of Punjab** reported in *(2012) 10 SCC 303* that where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled, although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored, securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor. In this regard, a specific reference was made to offences arising out of matrimony, particularly relating to dowry, etc. or a family dispute, where the wrong is basically to the victim but the offender and the victim have settled all disputes between them amicably, irrespective of the fact that such offences have not been made compoundable. The High Court may within the framework of its inherent power, quash the criminal proceeding or criminal complaint or FIR if it is satisfied that on the face of such settlement, there is hardly any likelihood of the offender being convicted and by not quashing the criminal proceedings, justice shall be casualty and ends of justice shall be

defeated. In view of the aforesaid application deserves to be allowed.

6. Hence, I proceed to pass the following order:-

ORDER

(i) The Criminal Application is allowed.

(ii) The First Information Report in connection with crime No.599/2022 registered at Police Station Jaripatka District Nagpur for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 323, 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and consequent proceeding arising out of the same bearing RCC No.1370/2023 pending before the learned 2nd Joint Civil Judge, Junior Division and Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nagpur is quashed and set aside to the extent of present applicant.

8. The criminal application stands disposed of in the above said terms.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(URMILA JOSHI PHALKE, J.)