

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

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.101 OF 2025**

Tushar Sudamrao Selukar & Anr. .... Applicants

versus

The State of Maharashtra & Anr. .... Respondents

.....

- Mr. Madhukar Parghane, Advocate for Applicants.
- Smt. M. H. Mhatre, APP for the State/Respondent.
- Ms. Pooja Phagnekar, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

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

**DATE : 17<sup>th</sup> APRIL, 2025**

**P.C. :**

1. Heard Mr. Madhukar Parghane, learned Counsel for the Applicants, Ms. Pooja Phagnekar, learned counsel for the Respondent No.2 and Smt. M. H. Mhatre, learned APP for the State.

2. The Applicant No.1 is the husband, whereas the Applicant No.2 is the mother-in-law. There is a complaint filed by the Respondent No.2 initially with CIDCO police station, but later on transferred to Lohgaon Police Station, Pune. Initially, an application was filed before Aurangabad bench of this Court for

quashing of the FIR. As the offence is transferred to Lohgaon Police Station, the application is also transferred to this Court.

3. The FIR is lodged with CIDCO police station, Aurangabad on 24/06/2017. It is for the offence punishable u/s 498-A, 506 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code and u/s 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. Their marriage was solemnized on 28/03/2016. After the marriage, the Respondent No.2 started cohabiting with the Applicant No.1 at Pune. It is her case that she had been harassed on account of non-fulfilling demand of certain articles. Fed up of the harassment she lodged complaint on 24/06/2017. The police have registered the offence and filed the charge-sheet. There are statements of the relatives and other witnesses. They are more or same on the same lines as per the averments in the FIR.

4. The Respondent No.2 is present. Now the parties have settled the dispute. She has filed an affidavit. She admits the contents. She has signed it. She is identified by her advocate. Both the spouses have decided to dissolve the marriage by

mutual consent. They have also agreed on certain terms that have been issued before the Family Court.

5. Now the parties have settled the dispute. The nature of the dispute is personal in nature. The society is not concerned. There is no point in keeping the prosecution pending. We are inclined to allow the application.

6. Hence, the following order :

### **ORDER**

- (i) The FIR originally registered vide C.R.No.439/2017 registered with CIDCO Police Station, Aurangabad City and R.C.G. No.3391/2018 arising out of it, pending before the J.M.F.C. Pune, are quashed and set aside.
- (ii) The application is disposed of.

(S. M. MODAK J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)