

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 492 OF 2025

Rutesh Vilas Mali

...Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra & Another

...Respondents

**WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 495 OF 2025**

Vilas Ganpatrao Mali & Another

...Applicants

Versus

State of Maharashtra & Another

...Respondents

Ms. Mohini Rephade h/f Mr. Daksha Punghera, Advocate for applicants
Mr. Atharva Bingardeve, Advocate for respondent No. 2
Mrs. Veera Shinde, APP for State

.....

CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.

DATE : 05th JANUARY, 2026

ORDER :

1. By these applications filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, applicants/in-laws and husband seek quashing of FIR lodged by the second respondent at Crime No. 78 of 2025 registered with Kavathe Mahankal Police Station, Sangli dated 04.03.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 504, 506 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. In short, it is alleged in the FIR that marriage between applicant- Rutesh Mali and the second respondent took place on 28.06.2023 and same was registered on 13.07.2024. At the time of marriage, seven tola gold and Rs. 1,00,000/- cash was given to the applicants. Initially for 15 days the second respondent was treated well and thereafter they started harassing her on pity grounds that she is unable to perform work, she cannot cook etc. In the month of August-2023, she went along with Applicant- Rutesh Mali (Husband) to Pune. From September, behavior of husband changed. He used to come home in drunken condition and used to abuse and beat her. He used to ask her to bring Rs. 10 Lakhs from her parents. Twice he tried to throttle her.

3. Perusal of FIR shows that there are specific allegations of physical and mental harassment against husband, applicant- Rutesh Mali. Therefore, his application deserves to be dismissed.

4. So far as father-in-law and mother-in-law are concerned vague and general allegations are levelled against them in the FIR and the material collected during the investigation is not sufficient to attract charge under Section 498A read with Section 34 of the IPC. It appears that only with a view to harass the applicants/in-laws, their names are incorporated in the FIR.

5. In the result, following order:

ORDER

- (I) Criminal Application No. 492 of 2025 is rejected.
- (II) Criminal Application No. 495 of 2025 is allowed.
- (III) FIR bearing Crime No. 78 of 2025 registered with Kavathe Mahankal Police Station, Sangli dated 04.03.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 504, 506 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code and proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed and set aside to the extent of applicants-Vilas Ganpatrao Mali and Sangeeta Vilas Mali.

(NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.)