

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

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 5160 OF 2025**

Fahad Ahmed Shaikh & Ors.

..Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

..Respondents

Mr. Arjun Singh Sethi for Petitioners.

Ms. Dhanalaxmi Krishnaiyar, APP for State/Respondent.

Mr. Ajay Karad for the Respondent No.2.

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

**DATE : 08 OCTOBER 2025**

**PC :**

1. This is a petition for quashing of the F.I.R. and the charge-sheet resulting in Sessions Case No.225 of 2015 pending before the Additional Sessions Judge, Dindoshi, arising out of the C.R.No.277 of 2024 registered at Varsova police station on 16.09.2014, under sections 376(1), 506 and 498A r/w. 34 of the I.P.C. and under section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act., and the other proceedings.

2. The F.I.R. is lodged by the Respondent No.2. The

Respondent No.2 was to get married with the Petitioner No.1. The other two petitioners are his parents. The marriage did not take place. Now the matter is completely settled between the parties. Both the parties have moved on in their respective lives. In this view of the matter, it is not necessary to go into the details of the allegations. However, briefly stated, the F.I.R. mentions that the Respondent No.2 was engaged to get married with the Petitioner No.1. They used to meet each other. They developed their physical relations. Subsequently, the Petitioner Nos.2 and 3 demanded the expenses and heavy amount from the Respondent No.2's father. This demand could not be met and, therefore, the marriage could not take place. In spite of that the Respondent No.2 and the Petitioner No.1 met each other. There was some dispute about the recording made by both of them on different occasions. But they resolved their dispute. She lastly met the Petitioner No.1 on 11.02.2014. After that he went on his job on a ship. He, thereafter, did not contact the Respondent No.2 and thwarted all her attempts to contact him. She was informed that he did not want to get married with the Respondent No.1. Therefore, she approached the

police station and lodged her F.I.R. The investigation was completed and the charge-sheet was filed. The charge-sheet contains the statements of the father and other relatives of the Respondent No.2. The main allegations are contained in the F.I.R. itself.

3. The F.I.R. was lodged in the year 2014. About more than 11 years have passed. The parties have moved on in their lives. The Petitioner No.1 is married and he is having his own family. The Respondent No.2 is also married with another person and she is living happily with her family. She is settled in a foreign country. At present she has come to India and she has filed her Affidavit giving her no objection for quashing of the proceedings. The Affidavit is affirmed before the Assistant Registrar of this Court. It is tendered by the learned Advocate for the Respondent No.2. It is mentioned in the Affidavit that she had moved on ever since and had started her own family. They have amiably settled the matter between them and she has no grievance against the Petitioners. She has no objection for quashing of the F.I.R. and the charge-sheet against the Petitioners.

4. Considering this situation, no purpose would be served in continuation with the criminal proceedings. The parties have settled in their lives and have their own family. Both the families would be disturbed and disrupted if this futile prosecution proceeded. Therefore, in the interest of justice, we are inclined to allow this petition.

5. Hence, the following order:

O R D E R

- i) The proceedings in Sessions Case No.225 of 2015 pending before the Additional Sessions Judge, Dindoshi, arising out of the C.R.No.277 of 2024 registered at Varsova police station on 16.09.2014, under sections 376(1), 506 and 498A r/w. 34 of the I.P.C. and under section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act., are quashed and set aside.
- ii) The writ petition is disposed of.

(SHYAM C. CHANDAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)