

SSK

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 415 OF 2014
IN
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 416 OF 2014
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 211 OF 2013**

Sulochana Vasant Jadhav and ors.

....Applicants

versus

The State of Maharashtra

....Respondents

Mr. Kishor S Patil, advocate for the applicants.

Mr. J. P. Yagnik, APP for the State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.**

DATED : 19th JANUARY, 2015.

P.C.:

For the reasons stated in paragraph Nos. 4 and 5, the delay of 1 year and 195 days occurred in filing criminal application No.416 of 2014 is condoned. The civil application is, accordingly, disposed of.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)

SSK

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 416 OF 2014
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 211 OF 2013**

Sulochana Vasant Jadhav and ors.
versus
The State of Maharashtra

....Applicants
....Respondents

Mr. Kishor S Patil, advocate for the applicants.
Mr. J. P. Yagnik, APP for the State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.**

DATED : 19th JANUARY, 2015.

P.C.:

For the reasons stated in paragraph Nos. 4 and 5, writ petition No.211 of 2013 stands restored to its original file. The civil application is, accordingly, disposed of.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)

SSK

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 211 OF 2013

Sulochana Vasant Jadhav and ors.

....Petitioners

versus

The State of Maharashtra

....Respondents

Mr. Kishor S Patil, advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. J. P. Yagnik, APP for the State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.**

DATED : 19th JANUARY, 2015.

P.C.:

Heard.

2. By filing this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has sought following reliefs:

(a) Issue an appropriate Writ/Order directing the Respondent-1 to take cognizance of the complaint of the petitioner and register F.I.R.

(b) Issue an appropriate Writ/Order directing the Respondent to consider the Representation dated 09.08.2012 so also the Representation dated 01.12.2012 submitted by the Petitioner and decide the same as expeditiously as possible.

3. Mr. Yagnik, learned APP, on instruction, make a statement that the petitioners' complaint/representation was considered and it was found that the dispute is essentially of civil nature. He stated that the petitioners were accordingly informed. In that view of the statement, nothing survives in the petition. The petitioners are always at liberty to file private complaint if advised. The petition, accordingly, stands disposed of.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)