IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 2658 OF 2025

1. LAXMAN HANUMANT SANGLE
2. Jagdish Popatrao Shinde
3. Aarti alias Mayuri Jagdish Shinde

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA
AND
Rajeshwari Abhijeet Sangle

...

Shri Swapnil Joshi, advocate i/by J.P. Legal Associates, Advocate for the applicants.
Shri D.B. Bhange, APP for Respondent No.1/ State.
Shri Mehul P. Kulkarni h/f Shri Thole Vinod I., Advocate for Respondent No.2.

...

CORAM : SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.
DATE : 03 November 2026

P. C. :-

1. At the outset, when this Court has shown disinclination to entertain this application as regards applicant No.1/ (Laxman Hanumant Sangle, father-in-law), the learned advocate for the applicants seeks permission to withdraw the application to his extent.

2. Hence, this Criminal Application is dismissed as withdrawn in respect of applicant No.1/ (Laxman Sangle).

3. Insofar as other applicants are concerned, applicant No.2 is brother-in-law and applicant No.3 is sister-in-law of respondent No.2/ informant.

4. The applicants are seeking quashment of FIR No.0265/2025 dated 21.06.2025 registered with the Cantonment Police Station, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, at the behest of respondent No.2, for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 323, 504 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

5. The learned advocate for the applicants submitted that the applicants have been implicated in the crime on account of their relationship with the husband of the informant. They have been falsely implicated in the crime and have no concern with the crime in question. The learned advocate, therefore, prayed for quashing of the FIR in question.

6. *Per contra*, the learned APP appearing for the respondent/ State as well as the learned advocate appearing for the respondent/ informant strongly opposed the instant application. They submitted that sufficient material is available against the applicants and their role is a matter to be decided at the time of trial. Hence, they prayed for rejection of the instant application.

7. At this stage, it would be apposite to refer to some judgments of the Hon’ble Supreme Court. The Hon’ble Supreme

Court in ***State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335***, laid down the categories of cases in which the High Court may exercise its inherent powers to quash criminal proceedings to prevent abuse of the process of law and to secure the ends of justice. Further, in ***Geeta Mehrotra v. State of Uttar Pradesh, (2012) 10 SCC 741***, ***K. Subba Rao v. State of Telangana, (2018) 14 SCC 452***, and ***Kahkashan Kausar @ Sonam v. State of Bihar, (2022) 6 SCC 599***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasized the need to scrutinize the allegations made against the relatives of the husband in matrimonial disputes and observed that general and omnibus allegations, without specific allegations disclosing their individual involvement in the alleged offences, may not justify the continuation of criminal proceedings against them. In the case in hand, the allegations against the applicants, therefore, need to be examined in the light of the aforesaid principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

8. After going through the FIR in question as well as the statements recorded by the Investigating Officer, it is found that the FIR has been lodged as a result of matrimonial differences between the husband and wife and that the relatives

of the husband have been implicated on account of their relationship with him. It is alleged in the FIR that the marriage took place on 27.11.2020 and after marriage, she was treated well for sometime, however, the husband used to harass her on petty issues and also started demanding the amount from her parents. Out of the wedlock, the couple has a child born on 11.09.2021. It is alleged that on 06.06.2025 the informant was driven out of the house and since then, she has been residing with her parents. It is alleged that the in-laws used to instigate her husband to harass the informant.

9. Applicant Nos.2 and 3 are residing at Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar whereas, the matrimonial house of respondent No.2 is at Deopur, Dhule district. Perusal of the FIR would indicate that the allegations against the applicants are found to be vague and general in nature. No specific incident, date or event has been stated in the FIR so as to attribute any specific overt act to the applicants. Therefore, such bald allegations, in the absence of specific allegations disclosing their individual involvement in the crime, are insufficient to justify the continuation of criminal prosecution against them.

10. In view of the aforesaid discussion, it is found that the applicants are implicated on account of their relationship with the husband of respondent No.2 and the allegations do not disclose their specific involvement. Therefore, in order to prevent an abuse of process of the Court and to secure the ends of justice, the instant application deserves to be allowed and the criminal proceedings against the applicants deserve to be quashed and set aside. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

(a) The Criminal Application is allowed.

(b) FIR No.0265/2025 dated 21.06.2025 registered with the Cantonment Police Station, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, at the behest of respondent No.2 and the further consequential proceedings arising out of the said FIR, are hereby quashed and set aside to the extent of the present applicant Nos.2 and 3. This application is dismissed as withdrawn to the extent of applicant No.1.

kps (SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.)