

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 191 OF 2026

Yogesh Yuvraj Patankar & Ors. ... Petitioners.

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr. ... Respondents.

Mr. Ruturaj N. Karande a/w. Mr. Shubhankar Kulkarni, Mr. Parth Munde, Advocate for Petitioners.

Mr. Krutik R. Kamble a/w. Mr. Rajesh More (thr. V.C.), Advocate for Respondent No. 2

Mr. Kiran Shinde, APP for Respondent/State.

CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.

DATE : 22nd JANUARY, 2026.

P.C. :

1. This Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is preferred for quashing of FIR bearing No. 323 of 2017 dated 9.11.2017 registered with Haveli Police Station, Pune and R.C.C. No. 948 of 2018 pending before the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Pune, arising out of the said FIR.

2. Mr. Ruturaj Karande, learned Advocate for the Petitioners and Mr. Krutik Kamble, learned Advocate for the Respondent No. 2 submit that the Petitioners and the Respondent No. 2 have amicably resolved their matrimonial discord and therefore, the Respondent No. 2 has, no objection for quashing the criminal proceedings.

3. The Petitioners are present in the court and are identified by their learned Advocate Mr. Ruturaj Karande. The Respondent No. 2 is present in the court and identified by Mr. Krutik Kamble, learned Advocate. Mr. Krutik Kamble, learned Advocate for the Respondent No. 2 tenders copy of the affidavit dated 21st January, 2026 executed before the Notary Ulka Babasaheb Ingawale, the same is taken on record and marked as “X” for identification.

4. Respondent No. 2 (Ms. Neeta Yogesh Patankar) states that affidavit (“X”) is filed out of her own free will and without any pressure from any person. She states that she has no objection for

quashing of the criminal proceedings initiated on the complaint filed by her. She submits that the matter between her and the Petitioner No. 1 (husband) is settled and compromised before the Family Court, Pune.

5. Mr. Ruturaj Karande, learned Advocate for the Petitioners and Mr. Krutik Kamble, learned Advocate for Respondent No. 2 jointly submit that the criminal proceedings be quashed. Mr. Kiran Shinde, learned APP for the State submits that in view of the affidavit ("X"), no purpose would be served in continuing criminal proceedings.

6. Considering the amicable settlement between parties, the statements made by the Respondent No. 2 in her Affidavit ("X"), the nature of dispute and having regards to the judicial pronouncements in the case of *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*¹ and *Narinder Singh & ors v. State of Madhya Pradesh*², I deem it fit and proper to exercise powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita to quash the criminal proceedings.

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303

² 2025 Sc Online Sc 466

7. Writ Petition is allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a). Consequently, the FIR No. 323 of 2017 registered with Haveli Police Station, Pune and the Charge Sheet bearing R.C.C. No. 948 of 2018 are quashed. There shall be no order as to costs.

8. Mr. Krutik Kamble. Learned Advocate undertakes to file vakalatnama on behalf of the Respondent No. 2.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)