

• • • • •

3. Ms Mulekar, the learned APP has submitted that the application filed by the Applicant under section 437 (6) of the Criminal Procedure Code was earlier rejected by the learned Magistrate. Said order was set aside by the Sessions Court on the application of the complainant. Subsequently, this Court by order dated 28.8.2014 set aside the order of the Sessions Court.

4. I have perused the records and considered the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the Applicant and the learned APP for the Respondent -State. The records reveal that the application filed under section 437 (6) of the Cr.P.C. was already dismissed by the learned Magistrate on merits. The learned Magistrate had observed that the Applicant was himself responsible for delaying the matter. The said order was set aside by the learned Sessions Judge and by order dated 28.8.2014 in Criminal Application No.434 of 2014 this Court had held that the earlier bail application filed by the Applicant was dismissed by giving a detailed order and hence, the learned Additional Sessions Judge was not justified in granting bail under section 437 (6) of the Criminal Procedure Code. It is thus, clear that in view of the said order the Applicant cannot once again seek bail under section 437 (6) of the Criminal Procedure Code.

5. Mr. Gole, the learned counsel for the Applicant has submitted that despite the directions of this Court the trial is not expedited and that so far only six witnesses were examined. He has submitted that the Applicant -accused has not been produced before the Court, which has resulted in delay in trial.

6. The learned APP has placed before the Court a report, which indicates that out of 82 hearings, the Applicant was produced before the Court on 44 hearings. He was not produced on 38 hearings as the Applicant had refused to attend the Court on 5 hearings and on 5 other hearings he had to be produced in another Court, wherein he was also facing trial. She has further submitted that the Applicant was not produced before the Court on 28 hearing because of law and order situation. Said explanation is certainly not justified.

7. The Investigating Officer is directed to ensure that the necessary escorts are provided to produce the Applicant in court on every date of hearing. The learned APP has submitted that 28 witnesses are yet to be examined. Considering the fact that the Applicant is in custody since 19.5.2013, the learned Magistrate is

directed to make every possible endeavour to dispose of the case as expeditiously as possible and in any event within a period of eight months from the date of the receipt of this order.

8. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)