

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

Writ Petition No. 1035 of 2025

Mr.Chandra Dev Ratnadev Singh ... Petitioner

V/s.

The State Of Maharashtra And Anr. ... Respondents.

Adv. Rinky Kanojia i/by Juris Domain Law Firm – Advocate for
Petitioner.

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

Mr. Rohan R. Jadhav a/w Rajendra H. Jadhav – Advocate for
Respondent No. 2

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

DATE : 5th March 2025.

P.C. :

This is the petition for quashing and setting aside FIR registered vide C.R. No.95 of 2020 dated 14th March 2020 with RCF Police Station under Sections 509,506 and 504 of IPC. It has resulted in Criminal Case No.396/PW/2021 on the file of Judicial Magistrate, (First Class) 52nd Court, Kurla, Mumbai. The prayer is made for quashing of the entire proceedings.

2. Heard Ms. Rinky Kanojia, learned counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. Yagnik, learned APP appearing for the State and Mr. Rohan Jadhav appearing for the Respondent No.2.

Digitally
signed by
LATA
SUNIL
PANJWANI
Date:
2025.03.11
11:52:39
+0530

LATA
SUNIL
PANJWANI

3. The FIR is lodged by the Respondent No.2. She has stated that she was working as house maid in the house of the Petitioner. The Petitioner had two daughters. He was residing with his wife and two daughters. The Petitioner's wife was working in a Bank. There used to be frequent quarrels between the Petitioner and his wife. The incident occurred on 30th December 2019 on same petty issue about cooking and buying some vegetables. The Petitioner started shouting at the Respondent No.2. It is her case that the Petitioner used abusive language and asked her to get out of the house. The Respondent No.2 got angry. She felt humiliated and according to her by verbal utterances her modesty was outraged. On these allegations the FIR is lodged. The investigation was carried out and the charge-sheet is filed. There is a statement of the Petitioner-wife in the charge-sheet in which she has mentioned that as soon as the Respondent No.2 complained to her, she helped her in lodging the FIR.

4. Now the matter is settled between the parties. The Petitioner's father passed away and his mother is suffering from brain hemorrhage. In this situation Respondent No.2 has decided to settle the matter. She has filed her affidavit in reply. In that affidavit she has stated that Petitioner is a father of two daughters. He has undergone personal tragedies as his father had passed away and his mother is in precarious health condition. She has specifically stated in her affidavit that she has no objection for quashing the proceedings. She is present in the Court. She is identified by her

learned counsel. She reiterated her contention in the affidavit, .. before the Court that she has no objection for quashing of these proceedings.

5. We have considered these submissions and the affidavit. The incident occurred on a petty issue. It was a private dispute. The parties have now settled the matter. The Respondent No.2 has decided to forgive the Petitioner who has gone through personal tragedies. No purpose will be served in continuation of the proceedings. It would be in the interest of all the parties concerned and in the interest of the Petitioner's daughters and his ailing mother that the prosecution is quashed. The Society at large is not involved. 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.95 of 2020 dated 14th March 2020 with RCF Police Station under Sections 509,506 and 504 of Indian Penal Code and consequent Criminal Case No.396/PW/2021 pending before Learned Judicial Magistrate (First Class), 52nd Court, Kurla, Mumbai are hereby quashed and set aside.

6. The Writ Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(S.M. MODAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J)