IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 4093 OF 2025
DISTRICT – PARBHANI

1] Keshavrao Baburao Ankushe
(Father-in-law)
2] Asha Keshavrao Ankushe
(Mother-in-law)
3] Bhagyshri Manoj Khangle
(Married sister-in-law)
4] Rajeshri Megharaj Ghumate
(Married sister-in-law)
5] Satyavati Yogesh Chavan
(Married sister-in-law)
6] Shradha Bhagavat Sonavalkar
(Married sister-in-law) ..APPLICANTS

VERSUS

1] The State of Maharashtra
2] The Superintendent of Police, Parbhani
3] Sonali Sachin Ankushe
(Original Complainant) ..RESPONDENTS

Mr. Kishor R. Doke, Advocate for the Applicants.
Mrs. B. B. Gunjal, APP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2 / State.
Mr. Kailas B. Jadhav, Advocate for Respondent No.3 / Complainant.

(CORAM : SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.)

DATE : 2nd NOVEMBER, 2026

PER COURT :

1. Heard the learned advocates appearing for the respective

parties.

2. The applicants are the relatives of Sachin Ankushe, the husband of respondent No.3 complainant. Applicant Nos.1 and 2 are the father-in-law and mother-in-law, and applicant Nos.3 to 6 are the married sisters-in-law of respondent No.3. The husband is not an applicant before this Court.

3. By this application under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the applicants are challenging FIR No.0310/2025 dated 22.07.2025 registered with the Manvat Police Station, Tq. Manvat, Dist. Parbhani, at the behest of respondent No.3, for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A and 323 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. As per the report lodged by respondent No.3 complainant, her marriage with Sachin Ankushe took place on 06.12.2019 at Manvat. It is alleged that she was treated well for some days, and thereafter the in-laws started ill-treating her. It is alleged that her husband, who is serving at the S.T. workshop at Beed, used to travel daily, and the in-laws intentionally did not permit her to accompany him, and that she was asked to bring Rs.5,00,000/- for purchasing a house at Beed. It is

further alleged that in June 2024, in-laws instigated her husband to beat her, and she was driven out of the house. As such, the aforesaid FIR came to be registered at the behest of respondent No.3 on 22.07.2025.

5. In pursuance of the aforesaid FIR, the investigation was set in motion and after completion of investigation, charges Sheet was filed. The learned Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Manvat, by order dated 14.10.2025 took cognizance and issued process, and the proceedings bearing R.C.C. No.83/2025 are now going on before the said Court. By amendment permitted by order dated 27.01.2026, the applicants have also challenged the said order.

6. The learned advocate for the applicants submitted that the allegations against the applicants are general and *omnibus*, without attributing any specific role to any of them. Applicant Nos.1 and 2 are aged persons, and applicant Nos.3 to 6 are married and reside at their respective matrimonial homes at Latur, Kalaburagi, Pune and Ambajogai, applicant Nos. 3, 5 and 6 having been married much prior to the marriage of respondent No.3. He further submitted that respondent No.3 alleges that she was driven out in June 2024, whereas

the FIR came to be lodged on 22.07.2025, after a delay of more than a year, which has not been explained. Hence, continuation of the prosecution would amount to an abuse of the process of law.

7. Per contra, the learned APP appearing for respondent Nos.1 and 2 / State as well as the learned advocate appearing for respondent No.3 complainant strongly opposed the instant application. They submitted that sufficient material is available in the charge sheet 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.

8. 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, ***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.

9. After going through the FIR in question and the material on record, it is found that the FIR has been lodged as a result of matrimonial differences between respondent No.3 and her husband, and that the relatives of the husband have been implicated on account of their relationship with him. The allegations of ill-treatment, of not permitting her to accompany her husband and of demand of Rs.5,00,000/- are made against the in-laws in general terms, without any specific date, incident or overt act attributed to any of the applicants. The only other allegation is that the in-laws instigated the husband to beat her in June 2024, which is also omnibus in nature. Applicant Nos.3 to 6 are married and reside separately at their respective matrimonial homes. Moreover, the FIR came to be lodged on 22.07.2025, more than a year after respondent No.3 was allegedly driven out of the house in June 2024, and the delay has not been

explained. Such vague and omnibus allegations are insufficient to justify the continuation of criminal prosecution against the applicants.

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.3 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 :-

O R D E R

(a) The Criminal Application is allowed.

(b) FIR No.0310/2025 dated 22.07.2025 registered with the Manvat Police Station, Tq. Manvat, Dist. Parbhani, at the behest of respondent No.3 and the further proceedings arising therefrom, including the order dated 14.10.2025 and R.C.C. No.83/2025 pending before the learned Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Manvat, are hereby quashed and set aside to the extent of the present applicant Nos.1 to 6.

(SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.)