



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (APL) NO. 1888 OF 2025

- APPLICANTS :**
- | | |
|------------------|---|
| (Husband) | 1. Krunal S/o Shankar Khangar,
Aged about : 37 years,
Occupation : Service,
R/o Plot No.27, New Bidipeth,
Nagpur, Tah. and Dist. Nagpur. |
| (Brother-in-law) | 2. Kushal S/o Shankar Khangar,
Aged about 36 years,
Occupation : Nil,
R/o Serinity Apartment,
Tilak Nagar, Hyderabad,
Tah. and Dist. Hyderabad. |
| (Father-in-law) | 3. Shankar s/o Tikaramji Khangar,
Aged about 73 years,
Occupation : Retired,
R/o Serinity Apartment,
Tilak Nagar, Hyderabad,
Tah. and Dist. Hyderabad. |
| (Mother-in-law) | 4. Nalini W/o Shankar Khangar,
Aged about 72 years,
Occupation : Household,
R/o Plot No.27, New Bidipeth,
Nagpur, Tah. and Dist. Nagpur. |

VERSUS

- NON-APPLICANTS :**
- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | The State of Maharashtra
Through the Police Station Officer,
Police Station Umred,
Tah. Umred, Dist. Nagpur. |
| 2. | Ruchira Kunal Khangar,
Aged about 34 years,
Occupation : Service,
R/o C/o Yuvraj Durugkar,
Plot No.667, Opposite Devadiya
Congress Bhawan,
Behind Chitnavis Park,
Near Shyam Talkies, Nagpur,
Tah. and Dist. Nagpur. |

Shri S. S. Bhalerao, Advocate for applicants.
Shri A. M. Joshi, Additional Public Prosecutor for non-applicant No.1.
Shri A. D. Patil, Advocate for non-applicant No.2.

CORAM: URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED : 20/02/2026.

ORAL JUDGMENT :

1. Heard. **Admit.** Heard finally with the consent of learned counsel appearing for the parties.

2. By this application, the applicants who are the husband and the nearest relatives of the husband approached this Court for quashing of the FIR by invoking the jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023.

3. A crime is registered on the basis of report lodged by the non-applicant No.2 on an allegation that the applicant No.1 is her husband and applicant No.2 is brother-in-law, applicant No.3 is father-in-law and applicant No.4 is mother-in-law. Her marriage was performed with applicant No.1 in the year 2018. After marriage, she resumed cohabitation at the house of present applicants. She is having one son from the said wedlock. There used to be quarrels on domestic reason between her and her husband. On 16/02/2021 as she had communicated with her mother and therefore, there was quarrel between her and her

husband and on that count, she was assaulted by the applicant No.1. She further alleged that the applicant No.1 frequently assaulting her and abusing her on the demand of money as well as ill-treating her physically and mentally. As far as other applicants are concerned, she submitted that on their instigation also, applicant No.1 is harassing her. On the basis of the said report, police have registered crime against the present applicants.

4. Heard learned counsel for the applicants who submitted that as far as applicant No.1 is concerned, he is withdrawing the application and the allegation against the accused applicant Nos.2 to 4 is concerned, which is general, omnibus and sweeping allegations. No specific instances are narrated as far as ill-treatment at their hands are concerned merely because they are the relatives of the husband, they are implicated in the alleged offence and in view of that, application deserves to be allowed.

5. Per contra, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the complainant strongly opposed the said contention and submitted that there are specific allegations as far as applicant Nos.2 to 4 are concerned, as on their instigation itself, the applicant No.1 was physically and mentally harassing her.

6. On hearing both the sides and on perusal of the investigation papers, it reveals that as far as applicant No.1

husband is concerned against whom, the specific allegations are levelled and for whom the learned counsel for applicants has withdrawn the application. The applicant Nos.2 to 4 are the in-laws of the non-applicant No.2 against whom the allegations are omnibus, general and sweeping in nature. The statements of the witnesses are also stereotype alleging general and omnibus allegations against them. It is well settled that mere reference of the names of the family members without assigning any specific instances is not sufficient to attract the offence punishable under Section 498-A of the IPC. In view of that, application deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, I proceed to pass following order :-

ORDER

- i] The application is allowed.
 - ii] The FIR in connection with Crime No. 447/2024 registered under Sections 85, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNSS, 2023 and consequent proceeding arising out of the same bearing RCC No.38/2025 is quashed and set aside to the extent of present applicant Nos.2 to 4.
 - iii] The application of applicant No.1 is disposed of as not pressed.
7. The application is disposed of.

[JUDGE]