

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 6750 OF 2025**

Rajneesh Suresh Sharma

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra.

... Respondents

Ms. Chaula Solanki a/w H. H. Nagi, Ms. Supriya Mishra, Ms. Simran Kazi
i/b NAGI & Associates.

Mr. V. A. Kulkarni, APP, for the Respondent-State.

Mr. Raviraj Gamare a/w Niranjana Pradhan for the Respondent No. 2.

CORAM : RANJITSINHA RAJA BHONSALE , J.

DATED : 9th FEBRUARY, 2026.

P. C. :-

1. The present Petition is filed for quashing of the Chargesheet bearing No. C.C. No. 902/PS/2021 pending before the Judicial Magistrate First Class, 66th Court, Andheri arising out of FIR No. 42 of 2020 dated 3rd July, 2020, under Sections 269, 323, 504, and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, registered with the Airport Police Station, Mumbai.

2. Learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that during the pendency of the present Petition, the Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 have amicably settled the matter. That the Respondent No. 2 has cleared the misunderstanding and settled the differences and issues between them. He submits that Respondent No. 2 has filed a Consent Affidavit dated 2nd

December, 2025, giving his consent for quashing of the Criminal Proceedings.

3. Respondent No. 2 present in Court and through his Advocate reiterates the contents of his Consent Affidavit dated 2nd December, 2025, duly notarized before the Notary Public. The learned Advocate for the Respondent No. 2 has identified the Respondent No. 2.

4. Perusal of the Consent Affidavit dated 2nd December 2025 filed by Respondent No. 2 indicates that Respondent No. 2 and the Petitioner have amicably settled and sorted out their disputes and differences. Respondent No. 2 has specifically stated in the Consent Affidavit that on the date of the incident i.e. on 2nd June, 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a lot of pressure in maintaining and doing Flight Inspections, Audit, Surveillance, Design Oversighting, Testing, Standardization of Examiners, and Evaluation of Simulators in compliance with DGCA Regulations. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there were constant changes in the protocols and rules in the DGCA, leading to a lot of stress, pressure and frustration at the work place. That, on the date of the incident, Respondent No. 2 was nominated by the DGCA to carry out the implementation of Anti-COVID Pandemic protocols in the training center and simulators at Air India CTE, Old Airport, Santa Cruz (E). Due to the said work pressure and the stress caused due to the COVID-19 pandemic,

the Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 had a heated argument with reference to the simulators and the standardization procedure. The said argument was in respect of the work and occurred due to the work pressure/stress at the relevant time. It is stated that, the incident that occurred arose purely out of a momentary lapse of reason during an emotionally charged discussion, amidst the prevailing stress and uncertainty caused by the COVID-19 situation. Respondent No. 2 has specifically stated that there was no deliberate intent or any conduct reflecting any deliberate intent from the side of the Petitioner. Respondent No. 2, in his Consent Affidavit, has given his no objection for quashing of the FIR bearing No. 42 of 2020 and C.C. No. 902/PW/2021. In para 8 of the Consent Affidavit, Respondent No. 2 has specifically stated that the Affidavit is filed without any force, coercion, pressure, or influence.

10. Perusal of the chargesheet prima facie indicate the intent of the Respondent No. 2 and the Petitioner as would required under the provisions of Section 269 are absent. That, the discussion between co-workers or colleagues in respect of the work and the manner in which the Anti COVID Protocols at the training center and stimulator was to be implemented gradually turned into arguments and then heated exchange of words. Perusal of the FIR, prima facie does not indicate that the Petitioner had any intention of spreading infection of disease which is

dangerous to life as is envisage under Section 269 of the Indian Penal Code. Perusal of the FIR and the concern Affidavit would clearly indicate that the initial discussion and the argument which subsequently occurred was clearly work related and not with the intention to insult or to provoke the breach of peace much less any criminal intimidation. This observation is made, in view of the averments made by the Respondent No. 2 in the Consent Affidavit dated 2nd December 2025, which clearly indicate the origin and genesis of the discussion and subsequent argument.

11. Considering the above facts and circumstances, I am inclined to quash the Chargesheet bearing C.C. No. 902/PS/2021 pending before the Judicial Magistrate First Class, 66th Court, Andheri filed in FIR No. 42 of 2020 dated 3rd July 2020.

11. In view thereof, the Petition is allowed in terms of prayer clause (a) and (b).

(RANJITSINHA RAJA BHONSALE, J.)