

nsc.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.286 OF 2015  
WITH  
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.239 OF 2016  
IN  
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.286 OF 2015**

Suresh Balram Patil ...Applicant

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra

2. Munna Sitaram Pujari ...Respondents

Mr.Girish Pawar h/f Mr.A.A.Dubey, for the Applicant

Mr.A.S.Shitole, A.P.P for the Respondent-State

Mr.Balbheem Patil, for the Respondent No.2.

***CORAM : REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.***

***DATE : 13<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2016***

**P.C. :**

1. Learned Counsel for the applicant and the respondent No. 2 state that the parties have arrived at a settlement and tender the Consent Terms dated 13<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, duly signed by the parties. The same are taken on record and marked 'X' for identification. Both the applicant and the respondent No. 2 are present in Court and have been identified by their respective Counsel.

2. As recorded in the Consent Terms, the applicant has agreed to pay the respondent No. 2 a sum of Rs.1,20,000/- by way of full and final settlement. As per the Consent Terms, the applicant has no objection if the respondent No. 2 withdraws the said amount of Rs.1,20,000/- deposited by the applicant, in the Trial Court. The respondent No. 2 has also given his no objection, to the quashing and setting aside of the impugned judgment and order dated 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 14<sup>th</sup> Court, Girgaum, Mumbai in C.C.No.2212/SS/2011 and confirmed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge/Special Judge (CBI), Greater Bombay, vide judgment and order dated 17<sup>th</sup> October, 2014 in Criminal Appeal No. 865 of 2014.

3. In view of the Consent Terms, the impugned judgment and order dated 5<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 14<sup>th</sup> Court, Girgaum, Mumbai and confirmed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge/Special Judge (CBI), Greater Bombay, vide judgment and order dated 17<sup>th</sup> October, 2014, are quashed and set-aside and the applicant is acquitted of the offence with which he is charged.

4. Respondent No.2 is permitted to withdraw the said amount of Rs.1,20,000/- deposited by the applicant, in the Trial Court, on furnishing the proof of his identity.
5. Application is accordingly disposed of on the aforesaid terms.
6. In view of the above order, Criminal Application No.239 of 2016 does not survive. The same stands disposed of accordingly.
7. All concerned to act on the authenticated copy of this order.

**REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.**