

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1233 OF 2015

Hari Govindsingh s/o. Kalyansingh
Thakur

..Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and anr.

..Respondents

--

Mr.A.N.Sabnis, advocate i/b. Mr.P.P.Uttarwar,
advocate for petitioner

Mr.R.V.Dasalkar, APP for respondent no.1 - State

Mr.Vivek Bhavthankar, advocate for respondent no.2

--

CORAM : M.T. JOSHI, J.

DATE : FEBRUARY 25, 2016

PER COURT :

Heard both sides.

2] Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. By
consent of the parties, heard finally.

3] Aggrieved by the orders passed by the trial
Court and learned Addl. Sessions Judge refusing to

hand over custody of the vehicle involved in the crime, present petition is filed.

4] The crime was registered for the offences punishable under Section 9, 39, 44, 48-A and 49 punishable under Section 51 and 52 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. The learned Addl. Sessions Judge, while rejecting the application of the present petitioner, has observed that the appeal itself can be decided expeditiously.

5] Since the Sessions Court was of the view that the appeal itself can be decided expeditiously, present Criminal Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Nanded or learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Nanded, to see that the appeal is heard within a period of four months and disposed of within the said period.

6] Rule is made absolute accordingly.

7] The parties to act on authenticated copy of this order.

[M.T. JOSHI, J.]

kbp