

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (APL) NO.728 OF 2016

(Balkrushna Rajendra Zinge..vs.. State of Maharashtra, through PSO.PS.Khadan, Akola)

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

Court's or Judge's orders.

Shri S.V.Sirpurkar, Advocate for applicant.

Miss T.H.Udeshi, A.P.P. for State.

CORAM : V.M. DESHPANDE, J.

DATED : JULY 27, 2017

After hearing learned counsel for applicant and after perusing the reply filed on behalf of the State, the learned Judge of the Court below has sufficiently complied with the provisions of Section 228 of Code of Criminal Procedure. It is to be noted that when the charge was framed that time the applicant was present. Though, his counsel was absent on the said day no application was moved by the applicant that charge should be framed in the presence of his counsel nor any application was moved on behalf of the learned counsel representing the application for adjournment.

In view of the above, at this stage it is not open to the applicant to submit that opportunity was not given to him before framing the charge. Hence, application stands rejected.

JUDGE