

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 716 OF 2015

Makarand Vilas Bartakke. ... Applicant.
Versus
Pallavi @ Priti Makrand Bartakke & anr. ... Respondents.

Mr. Bharat M. Sarda, advocate for Applicant.

Mr. Pradip Rajpur, advocate for respondent No.1.

Mrs. A.A. Mane, APP for State.

CORAM : SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV,J
DATE : MARCH 30, 2016

P.C.:

1 Heard the learned Counsel for the applicant and the learned Counsel for respondent.

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

3 Learned Counsel for the applicant has submitted that the learned Counsel for the respondent shall take instructions as to whether the respondent is willing to stay at Satara as the applicant is willing to make arrangement.

4 The respondent is present in the court. Learned Counsel for the respondent upon instructions submits that the respondent has to look after their 8 years' old child who is taking education at New Mumbai. The learned Counsel for the respondent submits that in the given circumstances, it is not possible for the respondent to reside at Satara. The learned Counsel for the respondent further submits that earlier respondent had filed an application seeking transfer of the proceedings from Satara to Vashi. The said application was rejected by this Court.

5 In view of these circumstances, the learned Counsel for the applicant seeks liberty to withdraw the application. Liberty as prayed for is granted in the interest of justice. However, it is made clear that

the the application has not been heard or considered on merits of the matter. The application is disposed of as withdrawn. The Rule stands discharged accordingly.

(SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV,J)