

Amk

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 951 OF 2016

Sou. Chitralekha Subhash Londhe & Ors. .. Applicants
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Anr. .. Respondents

Mr. M. A. Patil for the Applicants.
Mr. N. B. Patil, APP for the Respondent-State.
Mr. A. R. Pitale for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE AND
A. S. GADKARI, JJ.**

DATE : 31st JULY, 2017.

P. C. :

1. Heard Mr. Patil, learned counsel for the applicants, Mr. Pitale, learned counsel for respondent No.2 and learned APP for the State.
2. The petition is filed for quashing the FIR bearing C. R. No. II-20/2016 registered with Naupada Police Station, Thane against the Petitioner for the offence punishable under section 32 of the Representative of Peoples Act, 1950 read with Rule 134(1A) of the Representative of People Rules, 1951.
3. We have gone through the FIR annexed at Exhibit 'D'. The said FIR is registered at the instance of respondent No.2, Assistant Commissioner/Assistant Electoral Registration Officer. The FIR reveals that the applicants are teachers and their services are requisitioned in

pursuance of the circular No. RTI/2013 dated 22.05.2013 by Education and Sports Department. The applicants, however, refused to accept the orders in this regard from the respondent. *Prima facie*, it is clear that the applicants have committed an offence under section 32 of the Representative of Peoples Act, 1950 read with Rule 134 (1A) of Representative of People Rules, 1951 which is cognizable offence.

4. Mr. Patil, learned counsel for the applicants states that the orders were not served on the applicants, and therefore they have not committed an offence. We cannot entertain this argument at the stage of quashing the FIR as the allegation is that applicant refused to accept the said orders. We are, therefore, not inclined to entertain this petition and interfere with the subject FIR. The petition is dismissed.

[A. S. GADKARI, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]