

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.96 OF 2016
(Mangeshi Mohan Pitale vs. The State of Maharashtra)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders Court's or Judge's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Shri A.S. Deshpande, Advocate for applicant.
Shri P.S. Tembhre, Additional Public Prosecutor for
respondent.

CORAM : P.N. DESHMUKH, J.

DATED : APRIL 7, 2017

Heard Shri Deshpande, learned Counsel for
applicant, and Shri Tembhre, learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for respondent.

By this criminal revision application,
applicant seeks to challenge order dated 26/5/2016
passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amravati
granting vehicle bearing Registration No. MH-30/AA-
4932 on supratnama to her on her depositing Rs.1 lakh
with the Court with other conditions not to transfer the
vehicle, etc.

The vehicle is found involved in the offences
under Indian Penal Code and under Section 3 of the
Maharashtra Protection of Interests of Depositors (in
Financial Establishments) Act, 1999 registered by the
Economic Offences Wing, Amravati.

Shri Tembhre, learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for respondent, has opposed the application
contending that huge amount running into crores of
rupees is involved in the present crime and valuation of

Rs.1 lakh as calculated by learned Additional Sessions Judge is in fact lower than the cost of vehicle mentioned in the seizure panchanama.

Seizure panchanama reveals that valuation of said vehicle is shown as Rs.3 lakhs approximately. Learned Counsel for applicant states that same was calculated in the year 2013 and now since vehicle is lying idle with Police, it has deteriorated and its cost is also reduced and thus, amount of Rs.1 lakh is prayed to be reduced.

I am not impressed with the submissions advanced by learned Counsel for applicant for the reason that learned trial Court vide impugned order has already estimated value of the vehicle much lesser than what is stated in the seizure panchanama. Even otherwise, within span of two and half years, cost of vehicle cannot be reduced to less than Rs.1 lakh as contended on behalf of applicant. In that view of the matter, there is no substance in the criminal revision application and hence, the same is dismissed.

JUDGE

khj