

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

Writ Petition No.432 of 2025

1. Satej Vishwas Nakanekar
 2. Vishwas Vishwanath Nakanekar
 3. Kshama Vishwas Nakanekar
 4. Amit Vishwas Nakanekar
 5. Arun Vishwanath Nakanekar
- ... Petitioners

V/s.

1. Mrs. Aditi Satej Nakanekar
 2. State of Maharashtra
- ... Respondents.

Mr. Amol A. Deshpande, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr. J.P. Yagnik, APP for the State.

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

DATE : 23rd April 2025.

P.C.:

This matter is placed at the instance of learned counsel for the Petitioners for correcting the typographical error in the cause title of the order dated 3rd April 2025. The Petitioner No.2's name is wrongly mentioned. His correct name is Vishwas Vishwanath Nakanekar. It is a typographical error. It needs to be corrected. The Petitioner No.2's name shall read as 'Vishwas Vishwanath Nakanekar'.

Digitally
signed by
LATA
SUNIL
PANJWANI

Date:
2025.04.28
18:02:00
+0530

LATA
SUNIL
PANJWANI

2. The rest of the order shall remain as it is. The corrected order be uploaded.

(S.M. MODAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)

**CORRECTED ORDER DATED 3rd April 2025 READS
THUS:**

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 432 OF 2025

1. Satej Vishwas Nakanekar
2. Vishwas Vishwanath Nakanekar
3. Kshama Vishwas Nakanekar
4. Amit Vishwas Nakanekar
5. Arun Vishwanath Nakanekar

.....Petitioners

Versus

1. Aditi Satej Nakanekar
2. State of Maharashtra

.....Respondents

Adv. Amol A. Deshpande - Advocate for the Petitioners.

Adv. Ajay Jaybhay i/by Rushikesh Ganu – Advocate for Respondent No. 1.

Mr. J. P. Yagnik - APP for the Respondent-State.

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

DATE : 03rd APRIL 2025

P.C. :

1. This is a petition for quashing of the F.I.R. registered at

Sinhagad Road Police Station vide C.R. No. 64 of 2024 on 01.02.2024 and the consequent proceedings under Sections 498-A, 377, 323, 504, 506 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. The F.I.R. is lodged by the Respondent No. 1. The Petitioner No. 1 was her husband. The other Petitioners are his relatives, including his parents, brother, and uncle. The F.I.R. mentions that she got married with the Petitioner No. 1 on 23.12.2017. It was a love marriage. At that time, all the marriage expenses were borne by the informant's parents. After marriage, the Petitioner No. 1 started ill treating her. He used her money for making a down payment for the flat, which he booked in his own name. He also took the amount from the informant for eye surgery of his mother. There are allegations that she was ill-treated on the demand of Rs. 50 Lakhs. The other Petitioners supported the Petitioner No. 1. On these allegations, the F.I.R. is lodged.

3. Now, the matter is settled between the Parties. In fact, both of them have preferred a petition for divorce by mutual consent. The Respondent No. 2 has filed her affidavit, mentioning that the dispute between the Parties is settled. She has given her consent

for quashing the present proceedings. She is present in the Court. She is identified by her counsel. She reiterated the contents of the affidavit. She stated before the Court that she has no objection for quashing of the F.I.R.. as the dispute is settled between the parties.

4. The dispute is purely personal in nature. It is settled to the satisfaction of the first informant. No purpose will be served by the continuation of the criminal prosecution. Therefore, we are inclined to allow this petition. Hence, the following order :-

ORDER

(i) The Writ Petition is allowed.

(ii) The F.I.R. registered vide C.R. No. 64 of 2024 registered with the Sinhagad Road Police Station under Sections 498-A, 377, 323, 504, 506 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code and the consequent proceedings are quashed and set aside.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

(S.M. MODAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)