IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

985 CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 927 OF 2026

Ramanand Alias Sadanand Dnyanoba Sawant And Others
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra And Another

.....

Mr. S. B. Kadu, Advocate for Applicants.
Mr. C. V. Bhadane, APP for Respondent – State.

.....

CORAM : SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.
DATE : 22 OCTOBER, 2026

PC:

1. The office remark indicates that respondent No.2 has refused to accept the service. Therefore, service is complete. With the assistant of the learned APP, this matter is being disposed of accordingly.

2. When this Court expressed its disinclination to entertain the application insofar as applicant No.1 is concerned, learned counsel for the applicants sought permission to withdraw the instant application to the extent of applicant No.1.

3. Hence, the application is dismissed as withdrawn insofar as applicant No.1 is concerned.

4. The applicants are challenging the First Information Report No.47 of 2020, dated 11 February 2020, registered with Ahmadpur Taluka Police Station, District Latur, for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A,

323, 504, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, along with the consequential charge-sheet No.119 of 2020 and the order dated 6 January 2021 issuing process in R.C.C. No.217 of 2020, pending before the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class at Ahmadpur.

5. As per the FIR, respondent No.2 married to applicant No.1 on 21 May 2017. The FIR further discloses that at the behest of her in-laws, respondent No.2 was subjected to ill-treatment and was asked to bring Rs.1,00,000/- from her parents for purchasing a Pick Up Van. In pursuance to the said demand, she alleged that the applicants used to harass her mentally and physically. Due to the persistent ill-treatment, she lodged the aforesaid report.

6. Learned counsel for the applicants submit that no specific allegations have been made against applicant Nos.2 to 7. According to him, they have been deliberately implicated in false case merely because they are relatives of applicant No.1. He further submits that respondent No.4 to 7 were residing in separate houses. Moreover, the allegations do not disclose the commission of the aforesaid offences by them.

7. Mr. Bhadane, learned APP, strongly opposes the instant application. He submits that there is sufficient incriminating material against the applicants and therefore, the instant application deserves to be rejected.

8. After going through the contents of the FIR and the material placed on record along with the charge-sheet, it is found that respondent No.2 has levelled general allegations against applicant Nos.2 to 7. Even if the allegations are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety, they do not disclose the commission of any cognizable offence or make out a case against applicant Nos.2 to7. The said applicants are residing at different places. Thus, the allegations appears to have been made to implicate them in the present case.

9. In view of the above, and considering the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **State of Haryana Vs. Bhajanlal (1992 Supp (1) SCC 335; AIR 1992 SC 604)** and **Geeta Malhotra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh, Criminal Appeal No. 1544 OF 2018 (Arising out of S.L.P.(Crl.) No. 9651 of 2018)** the instant application is allowed to the extent of applicant Nos.2 to 7.

10. The Criminal Application is allowed. FIR No.47 of 2020, dated 11 February 2020, charge-sheet No.119 of 2020 and the order dated 6 January 2021 issuing process in R.C.C. No.217 of 2020, pending before the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class at Ahmadpur, are hereby quashed and set aside to the extent of applicant Nos.2 to 7.

(SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.)

Kiran Kawre