

# Mandar Deepak Pawar vs The State Of Maharashtra on 27 July, 2022

**Bench: Sanjay Kishan Kaul, M.M. Sundresh**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Criminal Appeal

No(s) .

442/2022

MANDAR DEEPAK PAWAR

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ANR.

Appellant (

Respondent

## O R D E R

The appellant and respondent No.2 were undisputedly in a consensual relationship from 2009 to 2011 (or 2013 as stated by the respondent No.2). It is the say of the respondent No.2 that the consensual physical relationship was on an assurance of marriage by the appellant. The complaint has been filed only in 2016 after three years, pursuant where to FIR dated 16.12.2016 was registered under Section 376 and 420, IPC.

On hearing learned counsel for parties, we find ex facie the registration of FIR in the present case is abuse of the criminal process.

The parties chose to have physical relationship without marriage for a considerable period of time. For some reason, the parties fell apart. It can happen both before or after marriage. Thereafter also three years passed when respondent No.2 decided to register a FIR.

The facts are so glaring as set out aforesaid by us that we have no hesitation in quashing the FIR dated 16.12.2016 and bringing the proceedings to a close. Permitting further proceedings under the FIR would amount to harassment to the appellant through the criminal process itself.

We are fortified to adopt this course of action by the judicial view in (2019) 9 SCC 608 titled “Pramod Suryabhan Pawar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Anr.” where in the factual scenario where complainant was aware that there existed obstacles in marrying the accused and still continued to engage in sexual relations, the Supreme Court quashed the FIR. A distinction was made between a false promise to marriage which is given on understanding by the maker that it will be broken and a breach of promise which is made in good faith but subsequently not fulfilled. This was in the context of Section 375 Explanation 2 and Section 90 of the IPC, 1860.

The Criminal appeal is accordingly allowed. Impugned judgment is set aside and the proceedings in pursuance to FIR dated 16.12.2016 stand quashed, leaving parties to bear their own costs.

... .. J . ( S A N J A Y K I S H A N K A U L )  
.....J. (M. M. SUNDRESH) NEW DELHI 27th JULY, 2022 ITEM  
NO.101 COURT NO.5 SECTION II-A S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A RECORD OF  
PROCEEDINGS Criminal Appeal No(s). 442/2022 MANDAR DEEPAK PAWAR Appellant(s)  
VERSUS THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ANR. Respondent(s) ([ PART-HEARD BY HON'BLE  
SANJAY KISHAN KAUL AND HON'BLE M.M. SUNDRESH , JJ. ] IA No. 69452/2018 -  
EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT) Date : 27-07-2022 These  
matters were called on for hearing today. CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KISHAN  
KAUL HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH For Appellant(s) Mr. G. Ananda Selvam, Adv.

Mr. Rajesh Khobragade, Adv.

Mr. Mayil Samy K, Adv.

Mr. Sanchit Maheshwari, Adv.

Ms. Lakshmi Ramamurthy, AOR For Respondent(s) Mr. Shirish K. Deshpande, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Chitnis, Adv.

Mr. Sachin Patil, AOR Mr. Aaditya A. Pande, Adv.

Mr. Geo Joseph, Adv.

Mr. Shwetal Shepal, Adv.

Mr. Purvish Jitendra Malkan, AOR Mr. Alok Kumar, Adv.

Mrs. Dharita Purvish Malkan, Adv. Ms. Nandini Chhabra, Adv.

Ms. Bhavna Sarkar, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following O R D E R The criminal appeal is allowed  
in terms of the signed order.

Pending application stands disposed of.

(RASHMI DHYANI PANT)  
COURT MASTER

(POONAM VAID)  
COURT MASTER

(Signed order is placed on the file)