



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

973 CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.706 OF 2025

1. Manvendra Sanjay Teli (Husband)
Age : 37 years, Occupation : Service.
[Application stands dismissed as withdrawn as against the applicant no.1
Manvendara Teli – Husband vide order dated 8.4.2025.]
2. Sanjay Sadashiv Teli (Father-in-law)
Age : 66 years, Occupation : Retried.
3. Jayshree Sanjay Teli (Mother-in-law)
Age : 56 years, Occupation : Houshold
4. Pournima Sanjay Teli (Sister-in-law)
Age : 35 years, Occupation : Houshold/Competitive Study
5. Sayali Sanjay Teli (Sister-in-law)
Age : 27 years, Occupation : Service,

Above all is R/o. Gajanan Housing Society,
Saidapur, Tal. Karad, Dist. Satara- 415124.

VERSUS

1. The State Of Maharashtra
Through the Police Inspector,
Mondha Police Station, Parbhani,
Tal. and Dist. Parbhani.
 2. Madhavi w/o. Manvendra Teli,
Age : 34 years, Occupation : Service,
R/o. 39, Santsena Nagar, Near Durgadevi Mandir,
Karegaon Road, Parbhani,
Tal. and Dist. Parbhani
- Respondents.

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. A.D. Lipne
APP for Respondents: Mr. S.R. Yadav-Lonikar
Advocate for Respondent-2 : Mr. M.P. Tripathi

...

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.

Dated : February 13, 2026

FINAL ORDER :-

1. The applicants no.2 to 5 seek quashment of the FIR dated 27.07.2024 in Crime no.358 of 2024 registered with Mondha Police Station, Parbhani for the offence punishable under sections 498-A, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Investigation was set in motion on the basis of information given by respondent no.2 alleging that on 07.12.2014 she got married with applicant no.1 as per Hindu rites and customs. She is blessed with a daughter. It is alleged that after two months of marriage, in-laws were doubting her character. She states that she was residing at Pune alongwith her husband in a rented flat during the period of 2014 to 2017 and she was made to bear expenses from her salary. Even on weekly holidays she was asked to visit matrimonial home at Karad and compelled to do household work. Her sister-in-law used to visit their house and insult her. She was asked to give details of her visits to hotels. She was scolded for taking lunch or dinner at Hotel.

3. Since 2016 her husband was transferred as Drug Inspector at Delhi. She was serving at Pune, but none of in-laws came to her help. While she was residing at Delhi,

demand was raised to her father to provide AC. In the year 2022, her husband was transferred to Mumbai. She was again made to visit matrimonial home at Karad. While she was residing at Pune, she was asked to bring 5 Lakh Rupees for purchase of flat. She was not provided medical treatment when she fell ill.

4. On the basis of aforesaid information, crime no. 358 of 2024 came to be registered. Investigation progressed and culminated into a charge-sheet. At present, criminal case is pending for trial.

5. Mr. Lipne, learned advocate appearing for applicants submits that FIR is based on unspecific, false and omnibus allegations. All the Family Members of husband are implicated. The respondent no.2 resided separately at Pune, Mumbai and Delhi where her husband was serving or she was serving. Allegations in the FIR or material in charge-sheet if taken on its face value, does not constitute offence under section 498-A of the IPC. FIR is full of domestic issues, which are usual in every family. Ingredients of offence under section 498-A cannot be gathered from the FIR. He would therefore urge to quash and set aside FIR and consequential proceeding.

6. Per contra, Mr S.R. Yadav-Lonikar learned APP and Mr. M.P. Tripathi, learned advocate appearing for respondent no.2 strongly opposes the prayers in application and submits that contents of FIR and material in charge-sheet is sufficient to relegate the applicants for trial.

7. Apparently, present application is filed by the in-laws of respondent no.2, except husband. Allegations in the FIR shows complaints of domestic nature. Further, allegations are unspecific, omnibus and does not link with each other. Apparently, respondent no.2 resided at Mumbai, Pune and Delhi along with her husband. Husband is in Government service as Drug Inspector. Respondent no.2 was also in service. Averments in the FIR depict that she was not happy with the joint family culture in the matrimonial house. Although, she was separately residing, she was fed up with frequent visits of relatives and indulgence in day to day affairs. However, at no stretch of imagination, allegations would constitute an offence under section 498-A of the IPC as against the applicants. Although, there are two events regarding demand of money for purchase of flat and purchase of AC, it is unspecific and there is nothing to show that such demand was persuaded or

respondent no.2 was coerced to meet with such demands. The applicants family appears to be financially capable to meet their requirements. Allegations of demand appears to be imaginary. Although, this Court is not expected to enter into merits of contentions in FIR, on examination of the averments in the FIR and statement of witnesses recorded during the course of the investigation, it is difficult to make out any offence under section 498-A of the IPC.

8. At this stage, reference can be given to observations of the Supreme Court of India in case of **Kahkashan Kausar alias Sonam and Others Versus State of Bihar and Others reported in (2022) 6 SCC 599** is relevant. Paragraph no.17 reads thus :-

“17. The above-mentioned decisions clearly demonstrate that this court has at numerous instances expressed concern over the misuse of section 498A IPC and the increased tendency of implicating relatives of the husband in matrimonial disputes, without analyzing the long term ramifications of a trial on the complainant as well as the accused. It is further manifest from the said judgments that false implication by way of general omnibus allegations made in the course of matrimonial dispute, if left unchecked would result in misuse of the process of law. Therefore, this court by way of its judgments has warned the courts from proceeding against the relatives and in-laws of the husband when no prima facie case is made out against them.”

9. In case of **Neelu Chopra and another Versus Bharti reported in (2009) 10 SCC 184** the Supreme Court of India has observed in paragraph no.9, which reads thus :-

“9. In order to lodge a proper complaint, mere mention of the sections and the language of those sections is not be all and end of the matter. What is required to be brought to the notice of the court is the particulars of the offence committed by each and every accused and the role played by each and every accused in committing of that offence. When we see the complaint, the complaint is sadly vague. It does not show as to which accused has committed what offence and what is the exact role played by these appellants in the commission of offence. There could be said something against Rajesh, as the allegations are made against him more precisely but he is no more and has already expired. Under such circumstances, it would be an abuse of process of law to allow the prosecution to continue against the aged parents of Rajesh, the present appellants herein on the basis of vague and general complaint which is silent about the precise acts of the appellants.”

10. Applying aforesaid exposition of law in present case, this Court finds that this is a case of over implication of in-laws. Continuation of trial against them would be abuse of process of law. In the result, Criminal Application is **allowed** in terms of prayer clause ‘B’ and ‘B-I to the extent of applicant nos.2 to 5 only and disposed of.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)

...