

GAYATRI
RAJENDRA
SHIMPI

Digitally signed
by GAYATRI
RAJENDRA
SHIMPI
Date: 2026.03.25
17:18:03 +0530

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 2727 OF 2025

Paramjit Singh Tarlochan Singh Kalsi ... Petitioner

Versus.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr. ... Respondents

Ms. Noorseema Baig, Advocate for Petitioner.

Mr. Moorrthy Acharya, Advocate for Respondent No. 2.

Ms. Pallavi Dabholkar, APP for Respondent – State.

Mr. Sopan Wadkar – PSI, Sakinaka Police Station.

CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.

DATE : 24th MARCH, 2026

P.C. :

1. By the present Petition, the Petitioner has sought for the following substantive reliefs in prayer clause (b) :-

“b) To issue appropriate Writ, Order and/or Directions to QUASH the FIR in C. R. No. 175 of 2025 lodged with Sakinaka Road Police station, for the offence punishable Under Sections 64(1), 308, 115(2), 351(2) of B.N.S, 2023 308, 351, of B.N.S.”

2. This petition has been circulated in view of the praecipe dated 13th March, 2026, on the ground mentioned therein.

3. Ms Noorseema Baig, learned Advocate for the Petitioner and Mr. Moorrthy Acharya, learned Advocate for Respondent No. 2, submit that the parties have entered into a settlement and therefore they seek quashing of the impugned FIR / charge-sheet by consent.

4. Ms. Pallavi Dabholkar, the learned APP for the State, referring to a record document indicating the purported settlement, strongly objects to the request to quash the criminal proceedings on the ground that the parties have amicably resolved the matter. She argues that, given the nature of the alleged offence and the purported settlement between the parties, the request made by Ms. Noorseema Baig and Mr. Moorrthy Acharya does not merit any leniency and therefore seeks dismissal.

5. In light of the objection raised by Ms. Pallavi Dabholkar, learned APP, Ms. Noorseema Baig, learned Advocate for the Petitioner, on instructions, seeks leave to withdraw this petition, which she states was filed seeking quashing of the criminal proceedings on the grounds of consent given by Respondent No. 2 (the prosecutrix) to quash the criminal

proceedings based on the settlement referred to in the document placed on record. She also seeks leave to file an appropriate proceeding to challenge the impugned FIR/charge-sheet on the merits.

6. Ms Pallavi Dabholkar, learned APP, submits that if the Petitioner files appropriate proceedings available under law, such proceedings should be considered after hearing the prosecution. She, however, reiterates her objection to entertaining the present petition in the form and with the documents as filed on record.

7. In view of the statement made by Ms. Noorseema Baig, learned Advocate for the Petitioner, leave to withdraw the present Petition is granted, with liberty to file appropriate proceedings if entitled in law, to challenge the impugned FIR / charge-sheet on merits.

8. It is clarified that this Court has not examined the merits of the case, and dismissing this petition does not prevent the merits from being assessed in appropriate proceedings. All contentions of the parties are left open.

9. Writ Petition No. 2727 of 2025 is dismissed as withdrawn.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)