

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.5901 OF 2024

1. **Brijesh Nandlal Parmar**
Age about 39 Years, Occupation : Job.
2. **Nandlal Parmar**
Age : 71 Years, Occupation : Nil,
Senior Citizen, Indian Inhabitant,
Both residing at : E-101, Shree Ram
Apartment, S. V. Road, Near Milap
Talkies, Goras Wadi, Kandivali West,
Mumbai : 400 067.
3. **Pragnya Kawa**
An adult, Occupation : Housewife.
4. **Bharat Kawa**
An adult, Occupation : Business,
Both residing at : 1601, Shreeji Paradise,
Khajuria Tank Road, Opposite to Majithia
Nagar and PVR Milap Cinema, Off to S.V.
Road, Kandivali West, Mumbai :400067. ...Petitioners

Versus

1. **The State of Maharashtra**
Through Kandivali Police Station,
Mumbai.
2. **Daksha Brijesh Parmar**
Age about 38 Years, Occupation : Housewife,
Residing at : Balubhai Makhwana, Siddhi
Vinayak Building, Krishna Nagar Society,
Backside of Paras Society, Taluka : Una,
District : Somnath, Gujarat : 362560. ...Respondents

Mr.Paresh Thakar – Advocate for Petitioners.

Mr.S.R.Agarkar – APP for Respondent No.1 – State.

Ms.Nazia Siddiqui – Advocate for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL &
S.M.MODAK, JJ.**

DATE : 12th FEBRUARY 2025

P.C. :

1. This is a Petition for quashing of the F.I.R., registered vide C.R. No.648 of 2024 at Kandivali Police Station under Sections 85, 115(2), 352, 126(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (“**BNS**”).

2. The F.I.R., is lodged by the Respondent No.2. The Petitioner No.1 is her husband. The Petitioner No.2 is the father of the Petitioner No.1. The Petitioner No.3 is his cousin and the Petitioner No.4 is the husband of the Petitioner No.3. The Respondent No.2 has stated that she had got married with the Petitioner No.1 on 24th May 2010 at Una, District : Somnath, Gujarat. At that time, the informant’s parents had spent for the expenses. After a few days of the marriage, the father-in-law started expressing his displeasure, as according to him, the informant’s parents had not spent sufficiently and had not given gifts.

The F.I.R., thereafter goes on to mention, petty issues and instances in which the informant was harassed and ill-treated. On 10th August 2023, the informant had gone to her

native place for attending a wedding. At that time, the husband quarreled with her, abused her and left her at that place itself and returned home. After that, she was not allowed to go back to her matrimonial house. There are allegations, that the other Petitioners did not permit her to enter the matrimonial house. Based on these allegations, the FIR is lodged.

3. Now, the dispute is settled between the parties. The Respondent No.2 has filed her Affidavit. In the said Affidavit, she has stated, that the disputes are resolved with the intervention of the well-wishers. The terms of compromise are annexed to this Affidavit at Annexure-A. She has received an amount of Rs.30,00,000/- (Rupees Thirty Lakh). She has clearly stated, in the Affidavit that she did not wish to pursue the case further and agreed to support the quashing of the FIR.

4. The informant is present in the Court. She is identified by her learned counsel. The Respondent No.2 stated before the Court, that she has “No objection” for quashing of the proceedings. The charge-sheet is also filed. She has given “No objection” for quashing of the entire proceedings including the charge-sheet. The dispute is purely personal in nature. The society in general is not involved. In these circumstances, the continuation of the proceedings will not serve any purpose

Hence, following order:-

O R D E R

- (i) The C.R. No.648 of 2024 registered with Kandivali Police Station and the resultant proceedings are quashed and set aside.
- (iii) The Petition stands disposed of.

(S.M.MODAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)