



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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1859 OF 2022

Rajendra Kisanrao Bhosale And Others

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Another

...

Adv. K. N. Shermale, Advocate for the Petitioner

Adv. S. N. Deshmukh, AGP for Respondent State

Adv. A. P. Gunge, Advocate for the Respondent No.2

...

CORAM : NITIN. B. SURYAWANSHI

AND

ROHIT W. JOSHI, JJ.

Dated : 08TH APRIL, 2025

PER COURT :-

. This Criminal Writ Petition is filed under Article 226, 227 of Constitution of India read with Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of the First Information Report No.0919 of 2022 registered with Kotwali Police Station, Ahmednagar under Sections 498-A, 323, 504, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, at the instance of the second respondent. Petitioners are in-laws of the second respondent.

2. It is alleged by the informant in the First Information Report that marriage of second respondent with Shyam Rajendra Bhosle, son of the petitioner nos.1 and 2 took place on 01.12.2019. After some

days of marriage, husband and the petitioners started insisting that the second respondent should bring Rs.10,00,000/- from her maternal house for purchasing new house at Pune. She refused to do so, therefore, they started physically and mentally harassing her. Thereafter, she alongwith her husband Shyam went to Pune where he was working, there she found that her husband was in constant contact with one lady. When he was confronted, he started quarreling with her. Husband used to beat her for fulfilling the demand of Rs.10,00,000/- for purchasing the house. On 17.07.2022, there was a meeting of petitioners, her husband, her maternal uncle and relatives. However, no way out could be found in the sense that it was stated that till she brings Rs.10,00,000/- for purchasing new house, she will not be permitted to cohabit with her husband. Thereafter, she lodged complaint on 03.09.2022 with Bharosa Cell, Ahmednagar. However, the matter could not be settled there and the in-laws told that they will not allow her in the house. Therefore she lodged the First Information Report in question.

3. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioners, learned APP for State and learned Advocate for the second respondent.

4. Perused the documents placed on record. Admittedly, the second respondent went to Pune, after some days of marriage. The

husband has lodged complaint of non cognizable offence against the second respondent stating that she is over ambitious and she is mentally harassing him, she always demands for purchase of four wheeler, insisting for hoteling and gold ornaments.

5. In the statement dated 08.10.2022, recorded before the Bharosa Cell, she has not alleged anything against the present petitioners that they were insisting for money of Rs.10,00,000/-. Considering the above aspects, it is clear that vague and general allegations are levelled against the petitioners without stating any details of the incidents of alleged illtreatment. It appears that petitioners' names are included in the First Information Report only with a view to pressurize the husband. In the light of above, continuation of prosecution against the petitioner would be an abuse of process of law. Hence, the Petition is allowed in terms of prayer clauses B and B-1.

(ROHIT W. JOSHI, J.)

(NITIN. B. SURYAWANSHI, J.)