



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 577 OF 2026

Somnath Dilip Mamdapure

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Another

...

Mr. C. D. Biradar, Advocate for Applicant

Mr. S. K. Shirse, APP for Respondents

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J

DATE : APRIL 09, 2026

PC :

1. The Applicant seeks quashment of FIR No. 60/2020 dated 13.03.2020 registered with Police Station, Osmanabad Rural for offences punishable under Section 354, 354(A) of the Indian Penal Code (Sections 74 and 75 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023) along with charge-sheet no. 99/2020 in RCC No. 384/2020.

2. The investigation was set in motion on basis of information given by Respondent No. 2. There is specific allegation that Informant and Applicant – Accused were in friendly relation. Therefore, even after marriage, they continued their conversation. They used to occasionally meet each other. The Applicant – Accused was insisting her to have a break in journey at Yedshi. Later on, was insisting her to divorce her husband. Even he used to demand money from her. He had some photographs in his mobile device, on the basis of which he started

blackmailing her. On the date of incident, he took her in field wherein standing crops are there and then sexually molested her. She escaped from field and then immediately rushed to bus stand of Yedshi and then proceeded to her matrimonial home at Barshi. Apparently, there are allegations against Applicant, which constitutes offence punishable under Sections 354 and 354-A of Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned Advocate appearing for Applicant endeavor to contend that there is delay in lodging FIR and relations between Applicant and Informant are not denied by Informant.

4. Even assuming that Applicant had friendly relations with Respondent No. 2/Informant, it cannot be said that he has right to sexually molest her. The delay in lodging FIR itself cannot be a ground for entertaining application for quashing of FIR, which is a matter of appreciation of evidence on record during course of trial.

5. In that view of matter, this Court finds no reason to entertain Application in exercise of inherent powers and hence, Criminal Application stands rejected.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)

Umesh