

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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 348 OF 2017

IN

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.365 OF 2013

Suvarna Sandeep Suryavanshi

... Applicant

Vs.

Sandeep Ishwar Suryavanshi & Ors.

... Respondents

...

Mr. Rajendra Sorankar I/b Ms. Shobhane Waghmare for applicant.

Mr. Vinod Joshi for the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

Mrs. M.R. Tidke, APP for the State.

...

CORAM : PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.

DATE : 14th JUNE, 2018

P.C.

1. The applicant had preferred Criminal Revision Application No. 365 of 2013 challenging the Judgment and Order passed by the learned Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, 24th Court, Borivali, Mumbai as well as Sessions Court acquitting the respondents for offences under Sections 498-A, 406 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code. The Criminal Revision Application has been admitted by this Court vide order dated 19th September, 2014.

2. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that after

filing of the Criminal Revision Application, the respondent No.1 has left the country and directions be issued to respondent No.1 to place on record his current address.

3. It appears that there are matrimonial dispute between the parties. The respondent No.1 is the husband of applicant. It is submitted by the learned advocate for the respondent No.1 that he apprehends that the applicant may misuse the disclosure of address and in the past the applicant had resorted to harrasment. It is submitted that the respondent No.1 is willing to furnish the address alongwith photo copy of the passport indicating the place of current address of Respondent No.1 in sealed cover. The learned advocate handed over the aforesaid document in envelope.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant on instructions further submitted that other respondents also may have left the country. In case the applicant finds that the other respondents have left the country, liberty is granted to the applicant to prefer an appropriate application before the appropriate Court.

5. In the circumstances, the respondent No.1 is directed to furnish the address in a sealed cover alongwith xerox copy of the passport.

6. The Registry is directed to keep the document submitted by advocate for respondent No.1 in sealed cover in safe custody in connection with the present proceedings.
7. No other relief sought in the application can be granted. The application stands disposed of.

(PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.)