



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CRLMC No.1139 of 2026

Amar Ranjan Das @

Amar Das & Ors.

....

Petitioner(s)

Mr. Bhabani Prasad Samal, Adv.

-versus-

State of Odisha & Anr.

....

Opposite Party(s)

Ms. Gayatri Patra, ASC

Mr. Surendra Kumar Rout, Adv.

(for O.P. No.2)

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI

Order No.

02.

ORDER

05.05.2026

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid arrangement.
2. By filing the present CRLMC, the Petitioners have prayed for quashing the entire criminal proceedings initiated against them in connection with Pahala P.S. Case No.371 of 2025, corresponding to G.R. Case No.2083 of 2025, pending before the learned J.M.F.C. (O), Bhubaneswar.
3. Heard learned counsel for all the parties.
4. Learned counsel for the Petitioners submits that Petitioner No.1 is the husband, Petitioner No.2 is the father in-law and Petitioner No.3 is the sister in-law of the Opposite Party No.2.
5. Learned counsel for the Petitioners further submits that that the dispute between the parties arises out of a



matrimonial discord between the Petitioners and Opposite Party No.2. During the pendency of the case, the parties have amicably settled all their disputes with the intervention of elders and well-wishers. Accordingly, the Petitioner No.1 and Opposite Party No.2 have resumed their conjugal life and are presently residing together peacefully. The parties have voluntarily resolved all matrimonial disputes, including the criminal cases pending against each other.

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further contends that, in the meantime, good sense has prevailed and both the Petitioner No.1 and Opposite Party No.2, along with their respective family members, have reconciled their differences and are now living in peace. As such, Opposite Party No.2 does not intend to proceed with the case any further.

7. Learned counsel for Opposite Party No.2, on the other hand, confirms the factum of settlement and submits that Opposite Party No.2 does not intend to proceed further with the case.

8. On perusal of the case record, it appears that the Petitioner No.1 and Opposite Party No.2 have filed an affidavit dated 29.04.2026 and the relevant portion reads as under:

“3. That in the meantime the parties have sorted out their difference at the intervention of the family members and now they are leading happy



conjugal life having no ill feeling towards each other.

4. That in view of the compromise between the parties, the informant do not want to proceed further in the present case and she does not have any objection if the criminal prosecution in the present case be quashed.

5. That since the parties have sorted out their difference and also leaving a happy and peacefully conjugal life, the present case may be allowed and the entire criminal prosecution be quashed."

9. Learned counsel for the State has no objection if the proceeding is quashed in view of the settlement between the Petitioners and Opposite Party No.2.

10. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, the contents of the affidavit brought on record and the nature of the dispute, this Court is satisfied that the parties have voluntarily resolved their disputes amicably.

11. It is well settled that in cases arising out of matrimonial disputes, where the parties have settled their differences amicably, the High Court, in exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, may quash the criminal proceedings to secure the ends of justice.

12. The Supreme Court in the case of *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*¹, held that criminal proceedings involving offences

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303



of a personal nature can be quashed where the parties have settled the matter amicably.

13. Further in the case of *Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.*², the Supreme Court laid down guidelines for quashing proceedings on the basis of compromise and observed that such power should be exercised where the dispute is essentially private and continuation of proceedings would be futile.

14. Similarly, in *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan & Ors.*³, the Supreme Court reiterated that in cases having overwhelmingly civil or personal flavour, the High Court may quash proceedings if the parties have settled the dispute, provided the offences are not heinous or serious in nature affecting society at large.

15. In the present case, considering the nature of the dispute and the fact that the parties have amicably settled their differences and are living peacefully, continuation of the criminal proceeding would be an exercise in futility and would not serve any useful purpose.

16. Accordingly, in exercise of the inherent powers under Section 528 of BNSS (erstwhile Section of the 482 Cr.P.C.), this Court deems it fit and proper to quash the criminal proceeding initiated against the Petitioners in connection with Pahala P.S. Case No.371 of 2025, corresponding to G.R.

² (2014) 6 SCC 466

³ (2019) 5 SCC 688



Case No.2083 of 2025, pending before the learned J.M.F.C.
(O), Bhubaneswar.

17. The CRLMC stands allowed and disposed of.

18. Pending application (s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

19. A copy of the order be communicated to the learned trial
Court for information.

(Dr. Sanjeeb K Panigrahi)
Judge