

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 227 OF 2015

Sau.Suhasini Subhash Mule .. Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr.G.V. Wani, advocate for the applicant.

Mr.A.R. Kale, A.P.P. for respondent/State.

CORAM : Z.A. HAQ, J.

DATED : 28.11.2016

P.C. :-

. Heard Mr. G.V. Wani, Advocate for the applicant and Mr.A.R. Kale, A.P.P. for non-applicant/State.

02. The applicant has challenged the order passed by the learned Magistrate accepting "B" summary report and dropping the proceedings pursuant to complaint filed by the applicant.

03. The contention of the applicant is that plot Nos.26 and 31 were owned by father-in-law and mother-in-law of the complainant/applicant and Vidya (accused No.1), both of them having acquired title from their respective husbands and Vidya has sold Plot No.26 without consent of the applicant by manipulating the records. It

is submitted that the order passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate accepting "B" summary is unsustainable and is required to be set aside and the accused are required to be prosecuted and convicted for the offence punishable under sections 468, 471, 465, 417, 420, 193, 201, 204 read with section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

04. The learned Magistrate has considered the material on record and the report submitted by the Investigation Officer and has prima facie found that the Plot No.31, which according to the applicant was owned by her husband and husband of Vidya, was sold by the applicant by sale-deed registered on 20th December, 1990 and Mutation Entry No.24872 was effected pursuant to the sale-deed. The learned Magistrate has found that the documents on record prima facie show that there was some arrangement by which Plot No.31 was given to Suhasini or her husband and Plot No.26 was given to Vidya or her husband. The learned Magistrate has recorded that the grievance of the applicant is of civil nature.

05. On examining the material placed on record of the Criminal Revision Application, I find that the conclusions of learned Magistrate cannot be faulted with. I see no reason to interfere with the impugned order.

06. The Criminal Revision Application is dismissed.
Parties to bear their own costs.

[Z.A. HAQ, J.]