

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 470 OF 2015

Smt. Archana Santosh Kharade. ... Applicant.  
Versus  
Santosh Appasaheb Kharade & ors. ... Respondents.

---

Mr. Nitin P. Deshpande, advocate for Applicant.

Mr. N. J. Patil i/b. Mr. A.N. Patil, advocate for respondent Nos. 1 to 5.

Mr. S.S. Pednekar, APP for State.

---

**CORAM : SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV,J**  
**DATE : JANUARY 18, 2016**

**P.C.:**

1 Heard the learned Counsel for the applicant, learned Counsel for respondents and the learned APP for State.

2 Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith with the consent of the parties.

3 The learned Counsel for the respondent fairly submits that the respondent is willing to bear travelling expenses of the complainant/applicant and her daughter from Pune to Ichalkarnji. The transfer of the case from Ichalkaranji to Pune was being sought on the ground of convenience, which cannot be considered. It is also admitted that the trial has commenced and the examination-in-chief of the complainant/applicant has been completed. The learned Counsel for the respondent fairly submits that he would restrict the cross-examination to the facts of the case. In view of this, the application seeking transfer being devoid of merits stands rejected and disposed of accordingly. Rule is discharged.

**(SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV,J)**