

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (APL) NO. 980 OF 2025

Amitkumar Jitendra Singh and anr.	... Applicants
Vs.	
State of Maharashtra and anr.	...Respondents

Mr. Satyaram Gaud a/w. Mr. Wilson Jaiswal and Mr. Maniram R. Gaud
for the Applicants.

Ms. S.D. Shinde, APP for the Respondent No.1 – State.

Dr. Samarth Shrikant Karmarkar a/w. Ms. Priti Rita and Mr. Tarun S.
Shrivastava i/b. Karmarkar and Associates for the Respondent No.2.

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

DATED : 24th SEPTEMBER, 2025

P.C. :-

1) This is an Application for quashing of the proceedings pending before 26th Court, J.M.F.C., Borivali, Mumbai vide C.C.No.823/PW/2016 arising out of C.R.No.195/2015 registered at Dahisar Police Station, Mumbai on 18/04/2015 under Sections 498-A, 406, 354(C), 323, 504 r/w. 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2) Heard Mr. Satyaram Gaud, learned Counsel for the Applicants, Ms. S.S. Shinde, learned APP for the Respondent No.1 – State and Mr. Samarth Karmarkar, learned Counsel for Respondent No.2.

3) The FIR is lodged by the Respondent No.2. The Applicant No.1 was her husband and the Applicant No.2 was her brother-in-law. The

matter is now completely settled between the parties and prayer is made for quashing by consent. Therefore, it is not necessary to refer to the allegations in the FIR in detail. However, briefly stated, the FIR mentions that the Respondent No.2 got married with the Applicant No.1 on 02/05/2014 at Panvel. Her parents had spent for expenses. The Applicants' family continuously demanded money. After her marriage, the Applicants started harassing her on the ground that the marriage was not performed to their satisfaction. On one occasion, she had suffered abortion but she was not looked after by the Applicants and in fact, the ill-treatment continued even then. She was told by the Applicant No.2 that the Applicant No.1 was having relationship with another woman. The demand for money continued. On one occasion, the Applicant No.1 recorded their intimate moments. He used to threaten the Respondent No.2 to make that video viral. On these allegations, the FIR is lodged.

4) The charge-sheet contains the statements of her parents, sister and other acquaintances. They have supported the allegations made by the prosecution.

5) Now, the matter is completely settled between the parties. The Respondent No.2 has filed her Affidavit giving her consent. She has stated that they had mutually decided to settle the dispute amicably. She has specifically recorded her no objection for quashing of these proceedings. She is present before the Court. She is identified by her learned Counsel.

She stated before the Court that she has no objection for quashing of these proceedings. She submitted that she does not entertain any apprehension anymore about the video clip referred to hereinabove.

6) Considering that the matter is completely settled between the parties to the satisfaction of the Respondent No.2, the pending prosecution serves no purpose. Therefore, we are inclined to allow this Application. Hence, the following Order :-

(a) The proceedings pending before the 26th Court of J.M.F.C., Borivali, Mumbai *vide* C.C.No.823/PW/2016 arising out of the FIR registered at Dahisar Police Station, Mumbai *vide* C.R.No.195/2015 dated 18/04/2015 under Sections 498-A, 406, 354(C), 323, 504 r/w. 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 are quashed and set-aside.

7) The Application is disposed of.

(SHYAM C. CHANDAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)

PREETI
HEERO
JAYANI

Digitally signed by
PREETI HEERO
JAYANI
Date: 2025.09.29
11:45:49 +0530