

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.40 OF 2025

1. Abhijit Subash Gaikwad	]
2. Ajit Subash Gaikwad	]
3. Vijay Dagdu Tupe	]
4. Vishal Vijay Tupe	] .. Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Maharashtra,	]
Through Chandannagar Police Station, Pune	]
2. Rajninath Shrinagnath Patil	] .. Respondents

Mr. Niranjan Mundargi with Mr. Siddharth R. Karpe and Ms. Keral Mehta, Advocates for the Petitioners.

Mrs. G.P. Mulekar, Additional Public Prosecutor for Respondent No.1.

Mr. Rishikesh Chindarkar, Advocate, i/by Asahi Legal, for Respondent No.2.

Mr. Rajninath Patil, the Respondent No.2, is present through V.C.

**CORAM : SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR, CJ. &
GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.**

**DATE : 7TH OCTOBER 2025.
[THROUGH HYBRID HEARING]**

Per Gautam A. Ankhad, J.

The present Writ Petition is a part of a batch of ten writ petitions, where the petitioners are the developers of a real estate project called 'Gracia'.

2. The FIR was registered by the respondent no.2 (the original complainant) against several persons. Out of them, the petitioners herein have settled their differences with the respondent no.2. Thus, the petitioners have filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking quashing, by consent, of the FIR bearing C.R. No.98 of 2016 dated 22nd May 2016 registered with the

Chandannagar Police Station, Pune and the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

3. The respondent no.2 is present through virtual mode and identified by his Advocate, Mr. Rishikesh Chindarkar. A copy of Aadhar Card of the respondent no.2 is tendered by the learned advocate. An affidavit dated 29th September 2025 of the respondent no.2 is tendered by Mr. Chindarkar across the bar which reiterates his client's no objection to the quashing of the FIR and any proceedings arising therefrom. The affidavit is taken on record and marked "X" for identification.

4. In view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in "*Nikhil Merchant v. C.B.I.*", (2008) 9 SCC 677 and as the petitioners do not have any further claim against the respondent no.2, continuation of these proceedings would be a futile exercise. Hence, Writ Petition No.40 of 2025 is allowed in terms of prayer clause (b), which reads as under:-

"(b) That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash and set aside F.I.R. bearing C.R. No. 98/2016, dated 22-05-2016 registered with the Respondent No.1 Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 405, 406, 416, 418, 420, 465, 467, 468, 469, 470, 472, 473 474, 475, 476, 120B R/w. 34 of the Indian Penal Code, and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom being the charge-sheet and RCC case number 3217/2018 pending before the learned 5th Judicial Magistrate First Class, Pune in the interest of justice."

5. It is clarified that the FIR bearing CR No.98 of 2016 and proceedings arising therefrom are quashed only *qua* the petitioners in the present Writ Petition. The proceedings as against the other accused will proceed and shall be adjudicated in accordance with law.

[GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.]

[CHIEF JUSTICE]