

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.5091 OF 2025

Sushant Bansal

.... Petitioner

versus

The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

.... Respondents

.....

- Mr. Murtaza Najmi a/w Mr. Abhay Khairwar, Advocate for Petitioner.
- Ms. Sangita E. Phad, APP for the State/Respondent.
- Mr. Kashish M. Singh h/f Mr. Dilip Shukla, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL &
SHYAM C. CHANDAK, JJ.**
DATE : 06th OCTOBER, 2025

P.C. :

1. This is a Petition for quashing of the FIR registered at MIDC Police station on 09/07/2025 vide C.R.No.490/2025 u/s 77, 78 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Heard Mr. Murtaza Najmi, learned Counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. Kashish M. Singh, learned counsel for the Respondent No.2 and Ms. Sangita E. Phad, learned APP for the State.

MANUSHREE
NESARIKAR

Digitally signed by
MANUSHREE
NESARIKAR
Date: 2025.10.09
12:13:15 +0530

3. The FIR is lodged by the Respondent No.2. She has stated that she got acquainted with the Petitioner five years ago. They were in contact with each other. She was residing at Andheri (E). But she had to vacate that place. Therefore, she had to shift to another flat. On 14/06/2025, she shifted her articles and goods. At that time, the Petitioner had helped her. He had booked services of movers and packers. He had also engaged an electrician because the Respondent No.2 wanted a charging point near her bed. All this was done, after she shifted to her new place. A few days since then, the Petitioner started enquiring with her about her friendship with other boys. She realized that he was having some information which nobody else could get. It was her private conversation made telephonically when she was in her bedroom. She even changed her mobile phone. But even then the Petitioner was getting all the information. On 05/07/2025, she closely inspected her bedroom. She came to know that there were some devices in the socket. There was a micro camera and a memory card. She connected the memory card to her laptop. She saw the video recording from her bedroom. She asked the phone number of

electrician from the Petitioner. But the Petitioner avoided to give further details. The Respondent No.2 therefore was convinced that it was handy work of the Petitioner himself and through that method he was knowing about her conversation. On this basis, the FIR was lodged.

4. The matter is now settled between the parties. The Respondent No.2 has filed her affidavit. She has stated that she was personally knowing the Petitioner since 2020 and they developed close relationship. The Petitioner had provided her with professional guidance and emotional and financial support. She has stated in her affidavit that the FIR was registered in a heat of moment and out of misunderstanding and that now the dispute was amicably resolved between them. She further stated that she did not want to proceed with the FIR. She further stated that this affidavit be treated as her consent for quashing of the present FIR.

5. The Respondent No.2 is present in the Court. She is identified by her learned counsel. The Respondent No.2 reiterated the contents of her affidavit before the Court. She

submitted before the Court that she genuinely wishes that the FIR is quashed and set aside. She submitted that she has patched up with the Petitioner and that she trusts him completely.

6. Considering this situation, no purpose would be served in continuation of the prosecution. It would be in the interest of justice and interest of both the parties who are young. We are inclined to allow this Petition.

7. Hence, the following order :

ORDER

- (i) The FIR vide C.R.No.490/2025 registered with MIDC Police station, Mumbai and the consequent further proceedings arising out of the said FIR, are quashed and set aside.
- (ii) The Petition is disposed of.

(SHYAM C. CHANDAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)