



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (APL) NO. 604 OF 2025

1. Shri Mayank s/o. Rajat Gupta,
Age about : 37 Years, Occ. : Service. (Husband)
2. Smt. Rashmi Wd/o. Rajat Gupta,
Age about : 62 Years, Odd. Household, (Mother-in-Law)
Both the applicants are R/o. Flat No.102,
Kapil Apartments, New Sneh Nagar, ... **APPLICANTS**
Nagpur - 440015.

...VERSUS...

1. State of Maharashtra,
Through Police Station Officer,
Police Station Koradi, Nagpur, Maharashtra.
2. Sau. Shivani w/o. Mayank Gupta,
Age : 34 Years, Occ.: Service,
R/o. Plot No.187, Smriti Nagar,
Koradi Road, Bokhara, Nagpur – 440026. ...**NON-APPLICANTS**

Mr. Vikrant Vishwarupe, Advocate for Applicants.
Mr. U. R. Phasate, A.P.P. for Non-applicant/State.
Mr. R. Siddharth, Advocate for Non-applicant No.2.

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, JJ.
DATE : 19/06/2025.

ORAL JUDGMENT (PER : ANIL S. KILOR, J.):-

1. Heard.
2. **ADMIT.** The matter is taken up for final disposal by consent
of learned Counsel appearing for the parties.

3. By way of present application the applicants are praying for quashment of Final Report No.26/2022 bearing Regular Criminal Case No.1114/2022 arising out of First Information Report vide Crime No.417/2021 dated 23.12.2021 registered with the Police Station, Koradi District Nagpur for the offences punishable under Section 498-A, 504 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. Today, the learned Counsel for the applicants and the non-applicant No.2 made a joint statement that the parties have settled the matter and the terms of settlement are reduced in writing under the caption of Mutual (Mediation) Agreement.

5. The non-applicant No.2 personally present in the Court. She has been identified by her Counsel. On interaction with her, she confirmed the fact of settlement and she desires not to prosecute the applicants.

6. In that view of the matter, considering the settlement and the desire expressed by the non-applicant No.2 not to prosecute the applicants, we are of the opinion that, even if, the trial is conducted, no fruitful purpose would be served and in that case, if the rule is exercised will be too futile. Hence, the application is allowed in terms of prayer Clause – ii.

7. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)