

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.4383 OF 2025

Pratik Jethalal Chheda & Anr.

.... Petitioners

versus

The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

.... Respondents

.....

- Mr. Ninad Bhabal i/b. Mr. Amit Bais, Advocate for Petitioners.
- Ms. Dhanalaxmi Krishnaiyar, APP for the State/Respondent.
- Mr. Shrinidhi A. Sonak i/b. Mr. Akash Gupta, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

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

DATE : 08th SEPTEMBER, 2025

P.C. :

1. This is a Petition for quashing of the FIR registered at Manikpur Police Station, Vasai-Virar, vide C.R.No.213/2023 u/s 498-A, 406, 323, 504 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code and all the proceedings arising therefrom.

2. The charge-sheet is filed and it appears that the cognizance is also taken. At this stage, the parties have settled the dispute and the prayer is made for quashing by consent.

3. We have heard Mr. Ninad Bhabal, learned Counsel for the Petitioners, Mr. Shrinidhi A. Sonak, learned counsel for the Respondent No.2 and Ms. Dhanalaxmi Krishnaiyar, learned APP for the State.
4. The FIR is lodged by the Respondent No.2. The Petitioner No.1 is her husband and the Petitioner No.2 is her mother-in-law. The gist of the FIR is that the Respondent No.2 got married with the Petitioner No.1 on 27/04/2013. There used to be frequent quarrels. The Petitioner No.1 was hot tempered. Both the Petitioners used to pick up quarrels on petty issues. There are allegations that the Petitioner No.1 was interested in other ladies and on that count also there used to be ill-treatment meted out to the Respondent No.2.
5. She was earning commission through insurance policies, mutual funds etc. the Petitioner No.1 wanted his share of the amount of Rs.10 lakhs, which she had earned as her commission. The Petitioners were not permitting the Respondent

No.2 to meet her daughter. On these allegations the FIR is lodged.

6. The FIR contains the statements of the brother, mother, brother's wife and neighbour of the Respondent No.2. Their allegations are similar to those mentioned in the FIR.
7. In this background, now the parties have settled the dispute. The Respondent No.2 has filed her affidavit. She has stated in her affidavit that they have mutually agreed to resolve the dispute with the intervention of friends and colleagues. The FIR was lodged through some misunderstanding. She has no objection for quashing of the FIR and the consequential proceedings.
8. The Respondent No.2 is present in the Court. She is identified by her learned counsel. She reiterated the contents of her affidavit and stated before the Court that she has no objection for quashing of the proceedings.

9. Considering this situation and in the interest of justice, as well as in the interest of both the parties, we are inclined to allow the Petition.

10. Hence, the following order :

ORDER

- (i) The Petition is allowed.
- (ii) The FIR vide C.R.No.213/2023 registered with Manikpur Police Station, Vasai-Virar and the further proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed and set aside.
- (iii) The Petition is disposed of.

(SHYAM C. CHANDAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)