

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.96 OF 2025

Tasleem Imran Sorathiya
and another

.....Applicants

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and another

.....Respondents

Ms. Nazneen Khatri, Advocate a/w. Khatri Mohamed Adil for
the Applicants.

Mr.B. V. Holambe-Patil, APP for the Respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Ashutosh Singh, Advocate for the Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL &
S.M. MODAK, JJ.**

DATE : 24th FEBRUARY, 2025

P.C. :

1. This is an Application for quashing of the FIR registered vide C.R. No.48/2024 at Mahim police station, Mumbai on 4.2.2024 and the consequent proceedings arising out of the charge-sheet. The offences are under Sections 354, 504, 506, 323 read with 34 of IPC.

2. Heard Ms. Nazneen Khatri, learned counsel for the Applicants, Mr.B. V. Holambe-Patil, learned APP for the

Respondent No.1-State and Mr. Ashutosh Singh, learned counsel for the Respondent No.2.

3. The Applicant No.1 is the Respondent No.2's brother-in-law's wife. The Applicant No.2 is the Applicant No.1's brother. The FIR lodged by the Respondent No.2 mentions that she was residing in a joint family of her husband consisting of her husband, mother-in-law, husband's brother and his wife – the Applicant No.1 along with the Applicants' children as well as Respondent No.2's children. The FIR mentions that there were long standing disputes between the Respondent No.2 and her husband's family. Various proceedings are initiated by both the parties. The subject matter of this FIR is the incident dated 3.2.2024. The incident had taken place at 9.10 p.m.. The FIR mentions that there was quarrel and fight between the Respondent No.2 and the Applicant No.1. It is further alleged that the Applicant No.1 called the Applicant No.2 through a telephonic call. He also came there and assaulted the Respondent No.2. In the process, he outraged the Respondent No.2's modesty. On these

allegations, the FIR is lodged.

4. Learned APP informed the Court that in this case the charge-sheet is filed. However, all the allegations are mentioned in the FIR itself. There are various disputes between the parties but they have finally settled all the disputes. The Respondent No.2 has filed her affidavit-in-reply. The Applicants have annexed a copy of the consent terms between the Respondent No.2 and her husband. The affidavit-in-reply of the Respondent No.2 states that the matter is settled between the parties through a deed of settlement and she has received the amount as mentioned in the deed of settlement dated 26.11.2024. She has specifically stated that she has no objection for quashing of the proceedings arising out of C.R. No.48/2024.

5. The Respondent No.2 is present before the Court. She is identified by learned counsel for the Respondent No.2. She stated before the Court that she stood by the averments in the affidavit-in-reply. She further stated before the Court that she has no objection for quashing of these proceedings.

6. The dispute between the parties is personal in nature. There are various complaints and counter complaints by the parties. All of them have been finally settled through a deed of settlement. Therefore, in the interest of all the parties, it is necessary that the present proceedings, which are subject matter of this Application, are quashed and set aside.

7. Hence, the following order:

:: O R D E R ::

- i. The FIR being C.R. No.48/2024 at Mahim police station, Mumbai as well as the consequent proceedings arising out of the charge-sheet, are quashed and set aside.
- ii. The Application is disposed of accordingly.

(S.M. MODAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)

PRADIPKUMAR
PRAKASHRAO
DESHMANE

Deshmane (PS)

Digitally signed by
PRADIPKUMAR
PRAKASHRAO
DESHMANE
Date: 2025.02.28
14:04:34 +0530