



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.2988 OF 2023

1. Ganesh Mahadev Hajare
(Husband of informant)
Age-25 years, Occupation-Education,
R/o. Chakarwadi, Tq. & Dist. Beed
2. Mahadev Nagu Hajare
(Father in Law of informant)
Age-55 years, Occupation-Service,
R/o. Chakarwadi, Tq. & Dist. Beed.
At present C/o. Shubham Raut,
Behind Police Station, Neknoor, Tq. & Dist. Beed.
3. Ashabai Mahadev Hajare
(Mother in law of informant)
Age-50 years, Occupation-Housewife,
R/o. Chakarwadi, Tq. & Dist. Beed.
At present C/o. Subham Raut,
Behind Police Station, Neknoor,
Tq. & Dist. Beed

...Applicants

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through Officer Incharge,
Police Station Pimpalner,
Dist. Beed
2. Prerna Baburao Maswale @
Prerana Ganesh Hajare
Age-19 years, Occupation-Household,
R/o. Karalwadi, Tq. & Dist. Beed
Mob.No.9545690638

... Respondents

....

Ms. Pooja S. Ingale h/f. Mr. S. J. Salunke, Advocate for the Applicants.
Smt. R. P. Gour, APP for Respondent/State
Mr. Y. L. Bidwe h/f. Mr. S. B. Bhosale, Advocate for Respondent No.2

....

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
ROHIT W. JOSHI, JJ.**

DATED : 03 JANUARY, 2025

JUDGMENT (Per Rohit W. Joshi, J.):

1. The present application is filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking quashment of FIR No.0048 of 2023 registered on 23.03.2023 with Pimpalner Police Station, District Beed for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 323, 504, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. Respondent No.2 is the informant. Applicant No.1 is husband of respondent No.2 and applicant Nos.2 and 3 are her father-in-law and mother-in-law respectively.

3. The application has been withdrawn on behalf of respondent No.1-husband on 02.11.2023. The matter is taken up for consideration with respect to case of applicant Nos.2 and 3.

4. Respondent No.2 has stated in the FIR that her marriage with applicant No.1 was solemnized on 24.12.2021 and after the marriage for a period of around one year the in-laws treated her well. However, after the short time when her father-in-law fell ill everybody started abusing her alleging that she has brought bad omen with her. It is also alleged that the in-laws raised doubts with respect to her

character and made allegations with respect to the same frequently and particularly when her relatives came to meet her. She alleges that initially applicant No.1 had demanded a sum of Rs.1.5 lakhs for purchasing drone camera. She alleges that the in-laws harassed her physically and mentally pressing this demand and therefore, her father was forced to give the said amount to applicant No.1. Having received the said amount of Rs.1.5 lakhs, further amount of Rs.2 lakhs was asked to be brought for making repayment of car loan. She again alleges that she was physically and mentally harassed for not being able to fulfill the said demand.

5. Applicant Nos.1 to 3 are all residing together. Respondent No.2 has levelled direct allegations against all of them. The allegations pertaining to demand for dowry indicate repeated demands. On one occasion an amount of Rs.1.5 lakhs was paid by father of respondent No.2 who succumbed to the pressure tactics adopted by the applicants and thereafter again further demand was made for a sum of Rs. 2 lakhs. The allegations in the FIR are again reiterated in the 161 statements of parents and relatives of respondent No.2.

6. The learned Counsel for the applicants submits that the allegations with respect to demand for dowry are not specific and that the same have been levelled only in order to falsely implicate the parents of estranged husband.

7. As against this, Smt. R. P. Gour, the learned A.P. P. and Shri. R. L. Bidwe, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2 urged that at the stage of consideration of an application for quashing of FIR the allegations made in the FIR have to be accepted as true and correct. The veracity thereof cannot be looked into at this stage. They submit that the allegations are consistent and do not indicate any attempt to falsely implicate the applicants.

8. Having heard the rival submissions and on perusal of the record, we find that the applicants have failed to make out any case for quashing of FIR and resultant prosecution in Regular Criminal Case No.273 of 2023. Respondent No.2 has levelled clear allegations with respect to demand for dowry. The demand for dowry was satisfied on one occasion. As per her allegations and thereafter again a demand was made for liquidating the loan for purchasing the car. In view of said allegations which are further corroborated by statement of the witnesses, we find that this is not a fit case for exercising our inherent powers under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing FIR and the Regular Criminal Case registered against the applicants.

9. The Criminal Application is therefore rejected.

(ROHIT .W. JOSHI)
JUDGE

A.G.Narwade

(SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI)
JUDGE