

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
BENCH AT AURANGABAD.
APPELLATE SIDE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.:6204 OF 2015
IN
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.:228 OF 2014

Bansi S/o Nivruti Kapse
VERSUS
Dnyandeo S/o Bhausahab Zuge

Mr. Rahul R. Karpe, Advocate for Petitioner.
Mr. D. G. Nagode, Advocate for Respondent.

WITH

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.:5754 OF 2014
IN
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.:228 OF 2014

Bansi S/o Nivruti Kapse
VERSUS
The State of Maharashtra and another

Mr. Karpe Rahul R. , Advocate for Petitioner.
Mr. S. J. Salgare, APP for Respondent No.1.
Mr. D. G. Nagode, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

WITH

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.:228 OF 2014

Bansi S/o Nivruti Kapse
VERSUS
The State of Maharashtra and another

Mr. Karpe Rahul R. , Advocate for Petitioner.
Mr. S. J. Salgare, APP for Respondent No.1.
Mr. D. G. Nagode, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM : **INDIRA K. JAIN, J.**

DATE : 20th November, 2015.

ORDER :

. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2 Applicant is original Accused in SCC No.572 of 2005 filed under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act by Complainant Dnyandeo Bhausahab Zuge. Said criminal case culminated in conviction of Accused. Accused being aggrieved with the order of conviction presented Criminal Appeal No.5 of 2009 before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ahmednagar. Vide order dated 18th October, 2014, appeal came to be dismissed.

3 Being aggrieved Criminal Revision Application No.228 of 2014 was filed before this Court challenging the order of conviction passed by the Trial Court and dismissal of appeal by the Sessions Court.

4 According to Applicant and Complainant they have settled the dispute. Affidavit is filed by Accused alongwith application and separate affidavit by Complainant wherein he states that his

grievances have been satisfied and they have compromised the matter.

5 In this premise Applicant / original Accused prays to quash and set aside the impugned order of conviction passed by learned Judicial Magistrate First Class and dismissal of appeal by the Sessions Court.

6 Parties are present in-person. They have been identified by their respective counsel. The terms of compromise have been verified from them. Both are relatives. They have settled the dispute with a view to maintain harmony and peace. Under these circumstances application deserves to be allowed in the interest of justice. Hence the following order -

ORDER

- I. Criminal Application No.6204 of 2015 is allowed in terms of prayer clauses (A) and (B).
- II. Criminal Revision Application No.228 of 2014 alongwith Criminal Application No.5754 of 2014 stands disposed of.

[INDIRA K. JAIN, J.]