



Experience law effortlessly

JUDGEMENTOPEDIA

(Learning Judgements For A Living)

1

Can criminal proceedings, particularly those involving non-compoundable offenses arising from matrimonial disputes be quashed by the High Court under its inherent powers (Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code) when the parties have reached an amicable settlement?

2

Whether Urdu alongside Marathi on municipal signboards is allowed under the Maharashtra Municipal Council, Nagar Panchayats and Industrial Township Act, 1965 and Maharashtra Local Authorities (Official Languages) Act, 2022 and if a citizen's plea to the Collector under amended Section 308 of the 1965 Act is maintainable?

3

Does carrying unauthorized passengers amount to a policy breach that nullifies theft coverage, and can Arbitration between the financier and complainant impact the insured's right to claim?

4

Refusal of 'TikTok' as a well-known mark by the Bombay High Court



June, 2025

Vol 51



JUDGEMENTOPEDIA

(Learning Judgements For A Living)

1

Jitendra Raghuvanshi and Others vs. Babita Raghuvanshi and Another
[(2013) 4 SCC 58]

2

Mrs. Varshatai Vs. The State Of Maharashtra Through Its Secretary, Ministry Of Law And Judiciary, Mantralaya, Mumbai And Ors.
[2025 INSC 486]

3

Manjeet Singh Vs. National Insurance Company Ltd. & Anr.
[(2017) ibclaw.in 244 SC]

4

TikTok Limited Faheem Ahmad Constituted Attorney of TikTok Limited Vs. The Registrar of Trade Marks Mumbai & Anr.
[2025:BHC-OS:8466]



Can criminal proceedings, particularly those involving non-compoundable offenses arising from matrimonial disputes be quashed by the High Court under its inherent powers (Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code) when the parties have reached an amicable settlement?

CONTEXT: This case arose from a matrimonial dispute between Jitendra Raghuvanshi and Babita Raghuvanshi, whose marriage took place in February 2002 . An FIR was lodged against Jitendra Raghuvanshi and his family for alleged offenses under Sections 498-A and 406 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 . During the pendency of these criminal proceedings, the parties reached an amicable settlement and sought to quash the charges . However, the trial court rejected their application, and the High Court subsequently dismissed the petition to quash the proceedings, stating it lacked the power to do so for non-compoundable offenses . The appellants then appealed this decision to the Supreme Court.

① The Supreme Court set aside the High Court's judgment dated 4-7-2012 and quashed the criminal proceedings in Criminal Case No. 4166 of 2011 .

② The Court ruled that the High Court's inherent powers under Section 482 CrPC are wide and unfettered and can be exercised to secure the ends of justice, even for non-compoundable offenses, particularly in matrimonial disputes where an amicable settlement has been reached.

③ Relying on the precedent set in ***B.S. Joshi v. State of Haryana [(2003) 4 SCC 675]***, the Court emphasized that Section 320 CrPC (Compounding of offenses) would not be a bar to quashing proceedings in such cases, and courts should actively encourage genuine settlements in matrimonial matters.

**JITENDRA
RAGHUVANSHI AND
OTHERS VS. BABITA
RAGHUVANSHI AND
ANOTHER
[(2013) 4 SCC 58]**

**SECTIONS 482, 320 OF
THE CRIMINAL
PROCEDURE CODE,
1973 (CRPC)**

**SECTIONS 498-A, 406
OF THE INDIAN PENAL
CODE, 1860 (IPC)**

**SECTIONS 3, 4 OF THE
DOWRY PROHIBITION**

Whether Urdu alongside Marathi on municipal signboards is allowed under the Maharashtra Municipal Council, Nagar Panchayats and Industrial Township Act, 1965 and Maharashtra Local Authorities (Official Languages) Act, 2022 and if a citizen's plea to the Collector under amended Section 308 of the 1965 Act is maintainable ?

CONTEXT: The appellant (Mrs. Varshatai) objected to the Municipal Council, Patur's signboard displaying its name in both Marathi and Urdu. The Council rejected this. The Collector, on her application under Section 308 of the 1965 Act, ordered 100% Marathi use, but the Divisional Commissioner set this aside. The High Court affirmed this, finding the appellant's application non-maintainable under the amended Section 308 and noting Urdu is a scheduled language. The Supreme Court remitted the case to the High Court to consider the newly enacted 2022 Act, which the High Court concluded did not prohibit additional languages on signboards.

- 1 The Supreme Court dismissed the appeal, upholding the High Court's decision.
- 2 The Court affirmed that the appellant's application to the Collector under Section 308 of the 1965 Act was not maintainable post-2018 amendment, as only the Chief Officer could file such an application.
- 3 Furthermore, the Court agreed that the 2022 Act does not prohibit the use of an additional language like Urdu on municipal signboards.
- 4 The Court emphasized language as a communication tool, not religion, highlighting Urdu's status as an Indo-Aryan language in the VIIIth Schedule.
- 5 This is consistent with states adopting multiple official languages under Article 345, as established in ***Uttar Pradesh Hindi Sahitya Sammelan v. State of Uttar Pradesh*** ((2014) 9 SCC 716). The Court found the appellant's case based on a "misconception of law".

MRS. VARSHATAI VS.
THE STATE OF
MAHARASHTRA
THROUGH ITS
SECRETARY, MINISTRY
OF LAW AND
JUDICIARY,
MANTRALAYA, MUMBAI
AND ORS.
[2025 INSC 486]

SECTION 308 OF THE
MAHARASHTRA
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
NAGAR PANCHAYATS
AND INDUSTRIAL
TOWNSHIP ACT, 1965

MAHARASHTRA LOCAL
AUTHORITIES (OFFICIAL
LANGUAGES) ACT, 2022

ARTICLE 345 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

Does carrying unauthorized passengers amount to a policy breach that nullifies theft coverage, and can arbitration between the financier and complainant impact the insured's right to claim?

CONTEXT: The appellant, Manjeet Singh, purchased a second-hand Tata truck and insured it for Rs. 7,28,000. On December 12, 2004, the vehicle was stolen after its driver, out of a "humanitarian gesture" on a cold night, gave a lift to three individuals who subsequently assaulted him and absconded with the truck. An FIR was lodged, and the finance company was informed. The insurance claim was repudiated by the National Insurance Company Ltd. on the ground that the driver, by giving a lift to passengers, had violated the policy terms. This defense was accepted by the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, and the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission. The District Forum also noted that arbitration proceedings between the financier and the complainant were underway.

1 The Supreme Court allowed the appeal, setting aside the orders of the lower courts. The Court held that carrying passengers, while potentially a breach of the policy, was not such a fundamental breach as to terminate the insurance contract.

2 Citing precedents such as ***National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Swaran Singh [(2004) 3 SCC 297]*** and ***Lakshmi Chand v. Reliance General Insurance [(2016) 3 SCC 100]***, the Court reiterated that an insurance company must not only establish a policy breach but also show it to be fundamental enough to end the contract.

3 The Court determined that the driver's act, though leading to the theft, could not have been foreseen and did not nullify the policy. Furthermore, the Court clarified that arbitration proceedings between the financier and the insured could not negate the insured's rights against the insurance company.

4 Consequently, the Supreme Court directed the National Insurance Company Ltd. to pay 75% of the insured amount of Rs. 7,28,000, along with 9% interest per annum from the date of filing the claim petition until deposit, and an additional compensation of Rs. 1,00,000 .

5 The amount is to be deposited with the District Forum, prioritizing payment of any arbitral award to the financier.

MANJEET SINGH VS.
NATIONAL INSURANCE
COMPANY LTD. & ANR.
[(2017) IBCLAW.IN 244
SC]

Refusal of 'TikTok' as a well-known mark by the Bombay High Court

CONTEXT: TikTok Limited, a technology company operating the TikTok mobile application, sought to have its registered trademark "TikTok" included in the list of well-known marks. The application, launched worldwide in 2017, gained immense popularity and was available in 155 markets and 75 languages by 2019. However, the Assistant Registrar of Trade Marks refused the application on October 31, 2023, citing the Government of India's ban on the TikTok application due to concerns over India's sovereignty, integrity, and other reasons. The petitioner challenged this order, arguing that the ban was a transient situation and not a proper ground for refusal, and that the Registrar failed to consider the relevant statutory provisions.

① The High Court dismissed the petition, upholding the Registrar's decision.

② The Court held that Section 11(6) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, allows the Registrar to consider "any fact which he considers relevant" for determining a well-known trademark, and the factors enumerated therein are illustrative, not exhaustive.

③ The Court found that the ban imposed by the Government of India on the TikTok application under the Information Technology Act, based on concerns for India's sovereignty, integrity, defense, security of State, and public order, was indeed a relevant fact for the Registrar to consider.

④ Although the Registrar incorrectly referenced Section 9 instead of Section 11, this alone was not grounds to set aside the order given the underlying valid rationale. The Court noted that the ban remains operative.

TIKTOK LIMITED
FAHEEM AHMAD
CONSTITUTED
ATTORNEY OF TIKTOK
LIMITED VS.
THE REGISTRAR OF
TRADE MARKS
MUMBAI & ANR.
[2025:BHC-OS:8466]

RULE 124 OF THE
TRADE MARK RULES,
2017

SECTIONS 11(6), (7),
(8), (9) OF THE TRADE
MARKS ACT, 1999