

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 362 OF 2000

The State of Maharashtra	.. Appellant
Vs.	
Balaji Manikrao Jadhav and ors.	.. Respondents

WITH

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 443 OF 2000
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 448 OF 2000
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 50 OF 2001
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 359 OF 2001
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 238 OF 2001

AND

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 7 OF 2006

Mr. D.V. Soman, Spl. Counsel for the appellant/State in all Criminal Appeals

Mr. Joydeep Chatterji, Advocate for respondent no.1 (362/2000)

Mr. S.A.G. Qureshi, Advocate for respondent nos.2 and 7 (362/2000)

Mr. K.E. Shinde, Advocate for respondent no.5 (362/2000)

Criminal Appeal No. 362 of 2000 stands abated as against respondent no.6 as per Court's order dated 23/2/2010

Mr. Swapnil S. Patil, Advocate for the respondent (443/2000, 448/2000), for respondent no.1 (50/2001), for respondent-sole (359/2001) and for respondents (238/2001)

Mr. R.M. Chavan, Advocate h/f. Mr. Vijay Sharma, Advocate for the respondents (7/2006)

CORAM : M.T. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 18/12/2015

ORAL ORDER :

Respondent nos. 3 and 4 in Criminal Appeal

No.362 of 2000 are absent. Despite issuing bailable warrants, they could not be traced.

2. In the circumstances, Mr. Swapnil S. Patil, Advocate is appointed as Amicus Curiae for advancing arguments on behalf of the respondent nos.3 and 4 in Criminal Appeal No.362 of 2000. He submits that the earlier arguments advanced in the connected group of Criminal Appeals be also adopted in Criminal Appeal No. 362 of 2000. Mr. D.V. Soman, learned Special Counsel appearing for the appellant-State in all these Appeals also made a similar request.

3. Written notes of arguments as well as the Synopsis are filed by both the sides. The same are accepted on record.

4. In the circumstances, ***Reserved for Judgment.***

[M.T. JOSHI]
JUDGE

arp/