

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.5265 OF 2025

Dinesh Rajendra PanditPetitioner
Versus
The State of Maharashtra
and anotherRespondents

Mr. Shakir Qureshi Advocate for the Petitioner.
Ms. Sharmila S. Kaushik, APP for the Respondent No.1-State.
Ms. Rupali Gond, Advocate i/b. Archana Gatte for the
Respondent No.2.

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

DATE : 14th OCTOBER, 2025

P.C. :

1. Leave to amend is granted to mask the identity of
the Respondent No.2. Amendment be carried out forthwith.

2. This is a Petition for quashing of the proceedings
arising out of C.R. No.499/2025 registered on 25.7.2025 at
Wadala Truck Terminal Police Station, Mumbai under Sections
78, 75 and 351(2) of the BNS, 2023 resulting in Case
No.890/PW/2025 pending before the J.M.F.C., 29th Court,

PRADIPKUMAR
PRAKASHRAO
DESHMANE

Digitally signed by
PRADIPKUMAR
PRAKASHRAO
DESHMANE
Date: 2025.10.16
12:05:57 +0530

Dadar (Camped at Sewree) Mumbai. The charge-sheet contains the statements of her friends who have supported her case. It is not necessary to refer to the allegations in the FIR and the charge-sheet in detail because the Respondent No.2 has filed the consent affidavit giving her no objection for quashing of these proceedings.

3. Heard Mr. Shakir Qureshi, learned counsel for the Petitioner, Ms. Sharmila Kaushik, learned APP for the Respondent No.1-State and Ms. Rupali Gond, learned counsel for the Respondent No.2.

4. Briefly stated, the allegations in the FIR, are that the first informant – the Respondent No.2 was a married lady and was residing with her husband, mother-in-law and a daughter. In April, 2025 she came in contact with the Petitioner through a social networking site. Their acquaintance turned into friendship. They were in touch through their mobile phones. They even met at some places. However, as she was a married lady, she was not able to meet him regularly. The Petitioner got angry and started threatening the Respondent

No.2. He threatened to make their photographs viral. On one occasion, he asked her to meet at some place and to establish physical relations. Getting fed-up, she lodged this FIR.

5. Today, the Respondent No.2 has filed her consent affidavit. She insisted that the proceedings be quashed. She has insisted in the affidavit that the dispute is resolved amicably, hence she was withdrawing all the allegations. She has stated that the case is pending before the J.M.F.C., 29th Court, Dadar, Mumbai vide case No.890/PW/2025. It is mentioned in the affidavit that she had filed that affidavit voluntarily and she is giving her free consent.

6. The Respondent No.2 is present in the Court. She is identified by her learned counsel. She submitted that she lodged this FIR out of anger but she does not want to proceed with the prosecution.

7. Considering the stand taken by her and also considering that the Respondent No.2 insisted that the prosecution be quashed and that she has no further

apprehension from the Petitioner, we are inclined to allow this Petition.

8. Hence, the following order:

:: O R D E R ::

- i. The FIR being C.R. No.499/2025 registered at Wadala Truck Terminal Police Station, Mumbai as well as the resultant criminal prosecution being Case No.890/PW/2025 pending before the J.M.F.C., 29th Court, Dadar (Campd at Sewree) Mumbai, are quashed and set aside.
- ii. The Petition is disposed of accordingly.

(SHYAM C. CHANDAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)

Deshmane (PS)