

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****WRIT PETITION NO. 3642 OF 2025**

- | | | | |
|----|------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1. | Rahul Labhuram Agarwal |] | |
| 2. | Geeta Labhuram Agarwal |] | |
| 3. | Sweety Raj Agarwal |] | ... Petitioners |

V/s.

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1. | The State of Maharashtra |] | |
| 2. | Simran Rahul Agarwal |] | ... Respondents |

Mr. Rahul R. Tiwari a/w. Mr. Arbind Tiwari for Petitioners.
Ms. M.M. Deshmukh, A.P.P. for Respondent No.1-State.
Mr. Vaibhav Khanolkar for Respondent No.2.
Officer :- P.S.I. Mr. Mohite, Versova Police Station, present.

**CORAM : A. S. GADKARI AND
RAJESH S. PATIL, JJ.**

DATE : 9th July 2025.

P.C. :

1) By this Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the husband (Petitioner No.1), mother-in-law (Petitioner No.2) and sister-in-law of Respondent No.2 (Petitioner No.3) are seeking quashing of Sessions Case No. 20 of 2024 pending with City Civil and Sessions Court at Dindoshi, Mumbai, arising out of CR No. 436 of 2019 , dated 22nd December 2019, registered with Versova Police Station, Mumbai, for the offence punishable

under Sections 498A, 313, 406 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, with the consent of Respondent No.2, the informant.

2) Heard Mr. Tiwari, learned Advocate for Petitioners, Ms. Deshmukh, learned A.P.P. for Respondent No.1-State and Mr. Khanolkar, learned Advocate for Respondent No.2. Perused entire record produced before us.

3) Mr. Khanolkar, learned Advocate for Respondent No.2 submitted that, the Petitioner No.1 and Respondent No.2 have executed Consent Terms dated 17th March 2025 and have filed before the Family Court at Bandra, Mumbai in Petition No. F-808 of 2025. That, as per the said Consent Terms, the Respondent No.2 is giving her consent for quashing of the crime in question. He submitted that, the Respondent No.2 has already filed her Affidavit dated 27th June 2025 on record. In para No.5 thereof, the Respondent No.2 has given her consent and no objection for quashing of the crime in question.

3.1) Respondent No.2 is personally present in the Court and through her Advocate reiterates the contents of her Affidavit dated 27th June 2025 and her no objection for quashing of the crime in question.

4) In view of the above, Petition is allowed in terms of prayer clause (A).

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)

(A.S. GADKARI, J.)