

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.2795 OF 2025

SATISH
RAMCHANDRA
SANGAR

Mehul Vasudev Thakar and Others

...Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Another

...Respondents

Mr.Saurabh Ghag a/w Ms.Nikita Chavan and Mr.Siddhant Raul
– Advocates for Petitioners.

Mr.B.V.Holambe – Patil – APP for Respondent No.1 – State.

Mr.Prashant Mishra a/w Mr.Bharat Jadhav i/b. Enact Legal –
Advocates for Respondent No.2.

Mr.Suryakant Doke – PSI – Borivali Police Station.

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

DATE : 8th MAY 2025

P.C. :

1. This is a Petition for quashing of the proceedings arising out of the C.R. No.663 of 2024 registered with Borivali Police Station on 4th September 2024 under Sections 498-A, 323, 504 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (“**IPC**”). The F.I.R. is lodged by the Respondent No.2.

The Petitioner No.1 is her husband. The Petitioner Nos.2 and 3 are his parents. The Petitioner No.4 is his brother.

The Petitioner No.5 is the wife of the Petitioner No.4. The other Petitioners are his uncles, and aunts. It is not necessary to refer to the allegations in the F.I.R. in detail, because the parties have settled their dispute. The charge-sheet contains the statements of the parents, and uncles of the Respondent No.2 who have supported the allegations in the F.I.R.

2. The gist of the F.I.R. is that the Respondent No.2 got married with the Petitioner No.1 on 22nd January 2005. Initially, she was treated properly but thereafter slowly, she was ill-treated by all the Petitioners including the Petitioner Nos.6 and 7 who were not part of their close family and yet used to remain in the house of the Petitioner No.1. The Respondent No.2 had to cook for all of them, and do household work.

3. She gave birth to her son on 3rd May 2007. Even after that, she was not treated properly. The F.I.R. thereafter goes on to mention about the extra-marital relationship of the husband – Petitioner No.1. She started residing separately with her husband and son from June-2023 near her parents' house. But, after a few days, the husband left her. She was not taken back to reside with the Petitioners family. There are allegations that the Petitioners used Rs.7,00,000/- (Rupees Seven Lakh)

earned by her to make a fixed deposit investment without joining her as one of the holders.

On all these allegations, the F.I.R. is lodged.

4. Now, the matter is completely settled between the parties. The Respondent No.2 has filed her Affidavit-in-Reply. She has stated that the Petitioner No.1 has agreed to pay total amount of Rs.25,00,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Lakh) and she has “*No objection*” for quashing of the present proceedings. The Respondent No.2 is present in the Court. She is identified by her learned counsel. An amount of Rs.10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten Lakh) through a demand draft is handed over to the Respondent No.2 in the Court today. The remaining amount is to be paid at the time of obtaining a divorce decree by mutual consent. She reiterated the contents of the Affidavit, and stated before the Court, that she has “*No objection*” for quashing of these proceedings.

5. The dispute between the parties is purely personal in nature. The society at large is not involved. The dispute is completely settled to the satisfaction of the Respondent No.2. Therefore, we are inclined to allow this Petition. Hence, the following order:-

O R D E R

(i) The F.I.R. registered vide the C.R. No.663 of 2024 with Borivali Police Station under Sections 498-A, 323, 504 read with 34 of IPC along with the charge-sheet, and the subsequent proceedings arising out of the said C.R. No.663 of 2024 are quashed, and set aside.

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

(S.M.MODAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)