

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1143 OF 2024

SATISH
RAMCHANDRA
SANGAR

Digitally signed by
SATISH RAMCHANDRA
SANGAR

Date: 2025.03.15
10:24:25 +0530

1. **Kiran Arun Khamkar**
Age : 40 Years, Occupation : Engineer,
Residing at : 502, Swami Krupa,
D. L. Vaidya Road, Dadar (W),
Mumbai : 400002.
2. **Ashwini Arun Khamkar**
Age : 67 Years, Occupation : Household,
Residing at : 502, Swami Krupa,
D. L. Vaidya Road, Dadar (W),
Mumbai : 400002.

...Applicants

Versus

1. **The State of Maharashtra**
Through Police Inspector,
Shivaji Park Police Station,
Dadar, Mumbai.
2. **Snehal Kiran Khamkar**
Age : 39 Years, Occupation : Service,
C/o Prabhakar Ambelkar, Residing at:-
402, Riddhi Siddhi, Vazira Naka, Near
Pranay Nagar, Borivali West,
Mumbai : 400091.

...Respondents

Ms.Sonali Chavan i/b. Dr.Uday P. Warunjikar – Advocate for Applicants.

Mr.J.P.Yagnik – APP for Respondent No.1 – State.

Ms.Armin Wandrewala i/b. Mr.Sagar Amrut Rane – Advocate for Respondent No.2.

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

DATE : 12th MARCH 2025

P.C. :

1. This is an Application for quashing of the Criminal Case bearing No.CC/PW/1047/2015 pending before the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate – Dadar arising out of the C.R. No.327 of 2015 registered at Shivaji Park Police Station – Dadar under Sections 342, 504, 506, 498-A read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (“**IPC**”).

2. The Respondent No.2 had filed the F.I.R. The Applicant No.1 was her husband and the Applicant No.2 was her mother-in-law. The F.I.R. mentions that the Respondent No.2 got acquainted with the Applicant No.1 through social networking site in the year 2007. They first met in the year 2009. They became friends. Their relationship turned into love. They got married on 10th June 2014. It is mentioned in the F.I.R. that the Applicant No.1 had told the Respondent No.2 that they would settle abroad but this promise did not turn out to be true. The F.I.R. mentions that the Applicant No.1 was having an extra-marital relationship with another lady. The Applicant No.2 was never happy with the marriage between Satish Sangar

the Applicant No.1 and the Respondent No.2. She used to humiliate her family. The Applicant No.1 used to ill-treat her.

These are the general allegations in the F.I.R. The investigation was carried out and the charge-sheet is filed. The charge-sheet contains the statements of the parents of the Respondent No.2.

3. Now, the matter is settled between the parties. The Respondent No.2 has filed her Affidavit-in-Reply incorporating the agreed terms. In paragraph No.11 of the Affidavit-in-Reply, she has clearly stated that she has given her consent to quash the present proceeding.

She is present in the Court. She is identified by her learned counsel. She told the Court that she has “No objection” for quashing of the proceedings. She reiterated the contents of her Affidavit. She stated that the settlement has taken place to her satisfaction.

4. Learned APP pointed out that the charges in this case are already framed. We have considered the situation.

5. The dispute between the parties is purely personal in nature. The society in general is not involved. Though the charges are framed, since the parties have settled the matter

and the dispute, we are inclined to allow this Application, even though, the charges are framed. In this regard, a reference can be made to the order passed on 13th November 2024 in Criminal Application No.978 of 2024 in case of ***Rushik Rajendra Shah & Ors. V/s. Ruchika Rushik Shah & Anr.*** In that order, this very issue was considered. In the interest of the parties, even after the framing of the charges, the proceedings were quashed. The situation in this present case is similar. We are inclined to quash the proceedings in the interest of both the parties. Hence, following order:-

O R D E R

(i) The F.I.R. registered vide C.R. No.327 of 2015 at Shivaji Park Police Station – Dadar and the Criminal Case bearing No.CC/PW/1047/2015 pending before the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate – Dadar are quashed and set aside.

6. With these observations, the Application is disposed of.

(S.M.MODAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)