

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD.

Office Memoranda of appearance, directions and orders.	Notes, of Court's orders and Registrar's	Office Coram,	Court's or Judge's orders.
--	--	---------------	----------------------------

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 616 OF 2015

RAMRAO S/O MURHARI PHAD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ANR

...
Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Murkute J.m.
APP for Respondent No.1: Mr. U. H. Bhogle.
Advocate for Respondent No.2: Mr. N. D. Kendre.

CORAM: T. V. NALAWADE, J.
DATED: 2nd JULY. 2015.

PER COURT:

1. The petition is filed to challenge the order made in Sessions Case No.6 of 2013 which is pending in the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Gangakhed in a case for offence punishable under section 306, 498-A and 34 of IPC. Application at Exhibit-35 was moved for discharge. The application is rejected by the trial Court. Both sides are heard.
2. This Court has gone through the papers of investigation. The papers include the statements of

parents of the deceased, brother of deceased, sister of deceased and also relatives on parents side of the deceased. The statements of parents of the deceased show that there was ill-treatment to the deceased from the husband and relatives. They had approached present applicant and they requested to do mediation so that their daughter is not given ill-treatment. Allegations are made that instead of doing mediation the applicant said to the parents of the deceased that it was desirable that they meet the demands of Rs.2 Lakh made by the husband and others otherwise there was no option and the deceased will suffer ill-treatment. There is specific allegations made by the parents of the deceased that the present applicant was giving instigation to the husband of deceased to give ill-treatment.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that present Petitioner is no way related to the husband of the deceased. He has produced family tree of the husband of the deceased to show that present applicant is not shown in the family tree. This contention cannot be considered, at this stage. In the statements made before the police it is contended that present petitioner

is the cousin of Tukaram, husband of deceased. There are specific allegations of aforesaid nature against the petitioner. This material is sufficient to make out a case for charge of aforesaid offence. This Court holds that there is no possibility of interference in the order made by learned Judge of the trial Court.

4. In the result, the petition stands dismissed.

[T. V. NALAWADE, J.]

Dt.02/07/2015
ans/616