

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1203 OF 2015

Satish s/o Sahebrao Tanpure

...APPLICANT

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra
and another.

...RESPONDENTS

...

Mr.A.M. Gholap Advocate for Applicant.

Mr.V.D. Godbharle, A.P.P. for Respondent No.1.

Mr.R.R. Karpe Advocate for Respondent No.2.

...

**CORAM: S.S. SHINDE AND
A.I.S. CHEEMA, JJ.**

DATE : 9TH JULY, 2015

ORDER :

1. Heard learned counsel appearing for the Applicant, learned A.P.P. for State and learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.2.

2. It is not in dispute that concerned Court has issued process. Being aggrieved, the Applicant

has filed this Application. According to the counsel appearing for the Applicant, in case revision is preferred, Revisional Court has limitations to consider the documents, in as much as the contents of the complaint filed by the complainant. Therefore, this Application is preferred under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

3. We have carefully perused the allegations in the complaint and find it difficult to reach to any definite conclusion in absence of the said allegations in the compliant being tested before the trial Court. In that view of the matter, leaving open the remedy as may be available to the Applicant, we dispose of this Application. The Application stands disposed of, accordingly.

[A.I.S.CHEEMA, J.]

asb/JUL15

[S.S.SHINDE, J.]