

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 2980 OF 2015
(Supriya W/o. Umesh Maske Vs. The State of Maharashtra
and others)

Mr. G.R. Syed, Advocate for the applicant
Mr.R.B. Bagul, A.P.P. for the respondent-State
Mr. S.P. Salgar, Advocate for respondent nos. 2 to 5

CORAM : M.T. JOSHI, J.
DATE : 06/01/2016

ORAL ORDER :

1. Heard both sides.
2. It is an admitted fact that the petition for dissolution of marriage is already transferred from Beed to Aurangabad. According to the applicant, there was incident of threatening to her relatives at Parali-Vaijinath and the photo copy of the non-cognizable case registered is filed on record. Besides this, the applicant is also residing at Aurangabad.
3. The dispute has arisen out of the matrimonial problems. Mr. G.R. Syed, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant would not press for personal appearance of the accused i.e. present respondent nos. 2 to 5 in the present Regular Criminal

Case No.177 of 2014 upon its transfer to Aurangabad, as they are residing at Beed.

4. Mr. S.P. Salgar, learned counsel for respondent nos. 2 to 5 opposed the application. He submits that the Regular Criminal Case is fixed for evidence.

5. Considering all the material on record and finding that the other proceedings are already transferred to Aurangabad, the present application is allowed in terms of prayer clause (B) of the present application.

. The learned Judicial Magistrate First Class to whom the present proceeding would be allotted, shall not insist on the personal appearance of respondent nos. 2 to 5 during trial since the identity of these respondents is not in question.

. The present application is accordingly allowed and disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
[M.T. JOSHI]
JUDGE