

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 4032 OF 2015

Ravindra Shivmurti Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and ors.

..Respondents

Ms. Mansha Khemka and Ms.Pinny Pathak i/b. M/s. Khemka and Associates, advocates for the petitioner.

Ms. M. H. Mhatre, APP for the State.

Mr. M. J. Bandgar along with Mr. A. M. Bandgar, advocate for the intervenor – Mr. Ajay Yadav.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
R. G. KETKAR, JJ.**

**DATE : 26th OCTOBER, 2015.
(In chambers)**

P. C. :

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for respondent Nos. 1 to 5 and learned counsel for the intervenor viz. Mr. Ajay Yadav.

2. Mr. Bandgar, learned counsel states that he has been instructed to appear on behalf of the intervenor – Mr. Ajay Yadav. However, he has not filed his vakalatnama. Mr. Bandgar undertakes to file vakalatnama.

3. The petitioner, his wife and their daughter – Miss Mansi Singh are present before the Court. The intervenor – Mr. Ajay Yadav is also present before the Court. We have interacted with them. The intervenor -Mr. Ajay Yadav claims that he and respondent No.6- Miss Mansi Singh are married. The petitioner and his wife, however, claims that their daughter – Miss Mansi Singh is aged 17 year old and a minor and, therefore, the marriage is not valid in the eyes of law. This fact, of course, is disputed by the intervenor – Mr. Ajay Yadav by saying that respondent No.6 is major. The respective parties have relied upon various certificates in order to support their claim about majority or minority of respondent No.6. The fact remains that this Court cannot go into that controversy in exercise of writ jurisdiction and the parties are left to adopt appropriate remedy in that regard.

4. During interaction, respondent No.6- Miss Mansi Singh stated that she is willing to go to her parents provided her parents do not file any complaint/FIR against the intervenor – Mr. Ajay Yadav in respect of the subject matter of this petition. The petitioner as well as his wife also stated that they have no grievance against the intervenor – Mr. Ajay Yadav and they do not intend to file any complaint/FIR in respect of the subject matter of the petition. Respondent No.6 and her parents further stated that they also have no grievance against the Police.

5. In the above circumstances, since respondent No.6 is produced before the Court by respondent No.3 and she has expressed her wish to go to her parents, we allow her to go to her parents. Since the petition is worked out, the same stands disposed of.

[R. G. KETKAR, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 452 OF 2015
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 4032 OF 2015

Ravindra Shivmurti Singh
Versus
State of Maharashtra and ors.

..Applicant

..Respondents

Ms. Mansha Khemka and Ms.Pinny Pathak i/b. M/s. Khemka and Associates, advocates for the applicant.
Ms. M. H. Mhatre, APP for the State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
R. G. KETKAR, JJ.**

**DATE : 26th OCTOBER, 2015.
(In chambers)**

P. C. :

Learned counsel for the applicant, having taken instructions from his client, seeks leave to withdraw the application. Leave as prayed for, is granted. The criminal application is dismissed as withdrawn.

[R. G. KETKAR, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]