

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 151 OF 2015

Ramesh Virbhadrapa Mandge & anr. ...Applicants

versus

The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

.....
Mr. S. B. Talekar, Advocate for applicants
Mr. G. O. Wattamwar A.P.P. for respondent/State
.....

CORAM : N.W. SAMBRE, J.

DATE : 14th OCTOBER, 2015

ORAL ORDER :

The learned Counsel for the applicant/accused in Special Case No. 2 of 2008 initiated under the provisions of Prevention of Corruption Act has questioned the order passed by the learned Special Court, passed on 13/08/2015 rejecting the application of the applicant for grant of adjournment for production of defence witnesses. The accused has examined his father namely Virbhadrapa Mandage and his cross-examination thereafter continue till 10/8/2015. On 12/08/2015 the same was concluded.

2. Thereafter, the applicant herein sought permission of the Court to produce other two witnesses in defence, who are his real

brothers. He sought inability to produce them on the date of matter, as according to him, they have occupied their business/service.

3. It is required to be noted that the applicant was put to the notice very much in advance about programme of the criminal trial. The applicant, as such, was aware about the dates on which the matter will be conducted before the Sessions Court.

4. Apart from above, perusal of the Roznama as is produced by learned A.P.P. reflects that, the applicant herein accommodated time and again various reasons including setting aside the evidence closed order and other relevant accommodations so as to give complete opportunity to the applicant.

5. Upon perusal of the contents of the application and analyzing the conduct of the applicant, the application for adjournment for production of defence witnesses is nothing but an intention to prolong the matter.

6. In my opinion, no case for interference is made out. Criminal Revision, as such, is rejected.

[N.W. SAMBRE, J.]