

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 296 OF 2026

Yogesh Mahadev Lokhande & Ors. ... Petitioners.

V/s.

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

Ms. Deepika Mule i/b. Mr. Prajit Manjrekar, Ms. Nilambari
Wadarkar, Advocate for Petitioners.

Mr. Sukanta Karmakar, APP for Respondent/State.

Ms. Sushma Patil, a/w. Mr. Prasad Helkar, Advocate for
Respondent No. 2.

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 the FIR No. 1232 of 2024 dated 21st August, 2024 registered with Bandra Police Station, Bandra.

2. Ms. Deepika Mule, learned Advocate for the Petitioners and Ms. Sushma Patil, learned Advocate for the Respondent No. 2 state that the Petitioners as well as Respondent No. 2 are present in the court. They jointly submit that the parties have resolved their matrimonial differences and the Respondent No. 2 has no objection for quashing the proceedings.

3. Ms. Sushma Patil, learned Advocate for the Respondent No. 2 tenders consent affidavit dated 20th January, 2026 affirmed before the Notary Manoj Kumar Chaurasita, Wadala, Mumbai. Same is taken on record and marked as “X” for identification. Respondent No. 2 (Ms. Priyanka Yogesh Lokhande) states that the affidavit (“X”) is filed out of her own free will and without any pressure from any person and the contents of the same are as per her say. She by reiterating the contents at paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the affidavit (“X”) submits that the Criminal Proceedings against the Petitioners be quashed.

4. Mr. Sukanta Karmakar, Learned APP for the State submit that in view of the affidavit (“X”), no purpose would be

served in continuing with the criminal proceedings and therefore, states that FIR can be quashed.

5. 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, *Narinder Singh & ors v. State of Madhya Pradesh*² and *Parbatbhai Aahir Alias Parbatbhai Bhimsinbhai Karmur and Others Vs. State of Gujarat and Anr.*³, there is no impediment if this Petition is allowed. I therefore deem it fit and proper to exercise the power under Section 528 of BNSS and quash the criminal proceedings.

6. The Petition is allowed in terms of the prayer clause (a). Consequently, FIR No. 1232 of 2024 dated 21st August, 2024 registered with Bandra Police Station, Bandra is quashed.

7. No order as to costs.

1 (2012) 10 SCC 303

2 2025 SCC Online SC 466

3 (2017) 9 SCC 641

8. Ms. Sushama Patil, learned Advocate undertakes to file vakalatnama on behalf of the Respondent No. 2.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)