

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.4040 OF 2016**

Mr. Ashutosh Dwarkanath Mayekar Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr. Respondents

Mr. Pranav Badheka i/by Mr. Prashant Pawar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Ms. Pallavi Dabholkar, A.P.P. for the respondent no.1- State.

Mr. H.S. Venegaonkar for Respondent-CBI.

Coram : Smt. R.P. SondurBaldota, J.

Date : 31st January, 2017

P.C.

1 Mr. Badheka, the learned advocate appearing for the petitioner states that the challenge to the impugned order in the present petition is restricted to the direction contained at para no.2 of the operative part of the order by which, respondent no. 2-CBI is directed to make, floppy seized during investigation, available to the petitioner for copying it and further direction to the petitioner to have the same copied on his own in the presence of CBI Officer. According to him the direction to the petitioner to get the floppy copied on his own is fraught with risk. Therefore the petitioner will be satisfied if respondent

no.2 makes a copy of the floppy available to him at his cost. The petitioner will thereafter make his own arrangements for reading the contents of the floppy. He states that on receipt of the copies of the floppy as well as copies of the statements, the petitioner intends to file an application for discharge. Mr.Venegaonkar agrees to provide a copy to the petitioner and states that the copy would be made available to the petitioner within a period of one week from today.

2 Mr. Badheka makes a grievance that respondent no.2 has not, till date supplied copies of the statements of the three witnesses as mentioned in the order. Mr. Venegaonkar states the copies would also be made available to the petitioner within a period of one week from today. The statements of Mr. Venegaonkar are accepted and the petition is disposed off in terms of the statements made.

(Smt. R.P. SondurBaldota, J.)