

Digitally signed by
HEMANT
CHANDERSEN SHIV
Date: 2025.09.19
16:53:02 +0300

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

WRIT PETITION NO.3193 OF 2025

Yatin Sharma & Ors.

...Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

...Respondents

Mr. Rahul Khan for the Petitioners.

Ms. Sharmila S. Kaushik APP for the Respondent No.1-State.

Mr. K. K. Khamare for the Respondent No.2.

Mr. Vikas Taktode, PSI, Hinjewadi police station present.

**CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL &
SHYAM C. CHANDAK, JJ.**

DATED : 17th SEPTEMBER, 2025

P.C. :-

1) Present Petition seeks quashing and setting aside of the FIR bearing No.36 of 2025, registered with the Hinjewadi police station under Section 498-A, 323, 504, 506 read with 34 of the I.P.C. against the Petitioners on the report filed by the Respondent No.2.

2) The Petitioner No.1 is husband and Petitioner Nos.2 to 4 are in-laws of the Respondent No.2.

3) Heard learned Counsel for the Petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the Respondent No.1-State and learned Counsel for the Respondent No.2.

4) The learned Counsel for the parties, at the outset, stated that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties. In view of the

settlement, Respondent No.2 has no objection to quash and set aside the FIR. An affidavit affirmed by the Respondent No.2, to that effect, has been placed on record.

5) Therefore, the allegations against the Petitioners leveled in the FIR need not be stated in detail. Briefly stated, the case of Respondent No.2 is that, the Petitioner No.1 and the Respondent No.2 got married on 06/07/2022. Thereafter, Respondent No.2 went to cohabit with the family of Petitioner No.1. Initially, Respondent No.2 was treated well by the Petitioners. After some days, Petitioner No.1 went to Canada to join his service there. Behind his back, Petitioner Nos.2 to 4 subjected Respondent No.2 with cruelty, on account of receiving lesser dowry. They used to taunt her that she could not cook properly etc. On 10/05/2023, Respondent No.2 joined the Petitioner No.1 at Canada. However, there, Petitioner No.1 treated her with cruelty on account of the demand of dowry. The other Petitioners aided him. Then, Petitioner, brought Respondent No.2 to India and leaving her with her parents, he went back. Therefore, Respondent No.2 filed the FIR and the offence came to be registered against the Petitioners.

6) Admittedly, the parties have settled their dispute. Pursuant to the settlement, they have decided to reside separately. They have filed necessary proceeding for divorce before the competent Court at Canada. Thus, they have buried their differences with an intent to lead a happy life.

The Respondent No.2 is present in the Court and stated that, she has no objection to quash the present FIR and reiterated the contents of her Affidavit. In the backdrop, the continuance of the impugned FIR and the proceedings arising out of said FIR would not serve any purpose. As a result, we are inclined to quash and set aside the said FIR in the interest of the parties as well as in the interest of justice. Hence, we pass the following Order :-

:: ORDER ::

- (i) Petition is allowed.
 - (ii) The impugned FIR bearing C.R. No.36 of 2025 registered with the Hinjewadi police station for the offence punishable under Section 498-A, 323, 504, 506 read with 34 of the I.P.C. against the Petitioners and the proceedings arising out of the said FIR are quashed and set aside.
- 7) Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(SHYAM C. CHANDAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)