

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.1610 OF 2026

Sreejit Rameshan And Ors ... Petitioners

Versus.

The State Of Maharashtra And Anr ... Respondents

Mr. Adhik Kadam, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. Imran Shaikh, learned Advocate for Respondent No.2.

Mrs. Rajeshree Newton, APP for the State.

PSI Mr. Amar Raut, Crime Branch, Pimpri Chinchwad, is present.

CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.

DATED : 9th April 2026

P.C.:

1. Heard, Mr. Adhik Kadam, Advocate for the Petitioners and Mrs. Rajeshree Newton, learned APP for the State.

2. Mrs Rajeshree Newton, learned APP for the State, on instructions from the Investigation Officer, states that the charge in R.C.C. No. 567 of 2023 was framed by the Court of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Vadgaon Maval, Pune, on 28th July, 2025. She submits that the Petitioners have willfully suppressed the said vital fact in this petition.

3. Upon a query to Mr. Adhik Kadam, Advocate for the Petitioners, regarding the averment in respect of the framing of the charge in the

memo of Petition, he answered in the negative.

4. Mr. Adhik Kadam states that the Petitioners, by this petition, have approached this Court for the quashing of the impugned FIR and the chargesheet by consent, not on the merits of the case. He submits that the complainant is agreeable to give no objection to the quashing.

5. Mrs. Rajeshree Newton, learned APP for the State, submits that the offence charged against the Petitioners is a serious offence, including extortion. She refers to the impugned FIR and states that a clear case of extortion is made out against the Petitioners. She raises apprehensions about the genuineness of the purported settlement between the parties in such a serious offence. She strongly objects to entertaining this petition and to the quashing of the impugned FIR by consent of the parties.

6. Perused records.

7. The impugned FIR and the material collected upon its registration, in unequivocal terms, refer to the acts of the Petitioners and make out the ingredients to attract the offences charged against them under Sections 383, 384, 385, 379, and 34, read with Section 120B of the Indian Penal Code. There is sufficient material on record to

proceed against the Petitioners.

8. Coupled with the said fact, charge was framed against the Petitioner in July 2025, which the Petitioners have conveniently failed to disclose. The non-disclosure of the said fact would, in the present case, amount to suppression. The order framing the charge is not challenged by the Petitioners.

9. The nature of the offences charged against the Petitioners is serious. Apprehensions expressed by Mrs. Rajeshree Newton, in the context of the settlement between the parties in the facts and circumstances of this case, more so from the nature of the allegations, cannot be ruled out.

10. In view of the above, particularly the objection by Respondent No. 1 to the quashing of the criminal proceedings by consent, I find that no indulgence is warranted to the Petitioners.

11. This Petition is therefore dismissed. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, there shall be no order as to costs.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)