

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION NO. 245 OF 2015
IN
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 6 OF 2013

MR.VIJAYKUMAR FADKE AND ANR.,	... Applicants
Versus	
CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA, REP. BY MANAGER, VERA BR. AND ANR.,	... Respondents

Mr. Ulhas Tari Ulhas, Advocate for the applicants.

Mr. Amey Jagdish Sinai Kakodkar, Advocate for the respondent no.1.

Ms. M. Pinto, Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent no.2.

Coram:- S. B. SHUKRE, J.

Date:- 29th January, 2016

P.C.

Heard Shri Tari, learned Counsel for the applicants, Shri Kakodkar, learned Counsel for respondent no.1 and Ms. Pinto, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent no.2.

2. This application seeks issuance of "appropriate order by this Court". When asked as to which order has been sought by the applicants from this Court, learned Counsel for the applicants states that respondent no.1 should be asked as to whether or not it is willing to compound the offence.

3. Learned Counsel for respondent no.1 submits that the applicants have not made any reasonable offer for compounding of the offence to respondent no.1 Bank nor have deposited the 10% of the present balance in the Bank to show bona fides. Therefore, he states that the respondent no.1 bank is now not interested in making any compromise in the matter.

4. In view of the statement made by the learned Counsel for the respondent no.1, it is now clear that compounding of the offence is not in sight and, therefore, the application is rejected and is disposed of.

S. B. SHUKRE, J.

SMA