

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 4865 OF 2015

Mr. Nitin Abhiman Mirgane. ... Petitioner.
Versus
Mrs. Anjali Nitin Mirgane @ Anjali
Arjun Wani & anr. ... Respondents.

Mr. Sunilkumar J. Kanoujia, advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Kavita P. Shinde h/f. Mr. Ashok B. Tajane, advocate for
respondent No. 1.

Mr. A.R. Patil, APP for State.

CORAM : SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV,J
DATE : AUGUST 4 2016

P.C.:

1 Heard the learned Counsel for the Petitioner, the learned
Counsel for the respondent and the learned APP for State.

2 Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith with the consent of the
parties.

3 Today the respondent is present in the court and genuineness of her identity has been verified by the learned APP. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner and the respondent have amicably settled the issues between them. That the Consent Terms are filed in the Family Court at Mumbai in Petition No. A-2543/2015. That they have filed consent terms for divorce by mutual consent. The Consent Term indicates that both the parties have decided to withdraw the proceedings filed against each other. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the respondent in person submit that they will abide by their consent terms. The Consent Terms alongwith joint affidavit of the Petitioner and the respondent is taken on record and marked as Article "X" for the purpose of identification.

4 In view of the fact that the parties have amicably settled the dispute, the petition deserves to be disposed of in view of the consent terms.

5 Accordingly, Rule is made absolute in terms of prayer clause

(a). The petition is disposed of accordingly.

(SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV,J)