

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRI. APPLICATION NO. 114 OF 2019

Amit Nivrutti Malunje ... Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Anr. ... Respondents

Mr. Hrishikesh Mundergir i/by Jayant Bardeskar for the applicant.

Mr. Tejas Hilage for respondent no. 2.

Mr. Vinod Chate, APP for respondent State.

**CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI &
REVATI MOHITE DERE, JJ.**

DATE : MARCH 28, 2019

P.C.:

Registry has placed the matter pointing out apparent inconsistent direction in paragraph 5 of the order dated 25/2/2019. Respective counsel for the applicant, respondent no. 2 and State Government are present.

2. Accordingly we delete the last sentence in paragraph 5 namely "Rule is discharged".

3. Respective counsel for the parties state that though presence of respondent no.2 is marked in the body of the order, but it has not been reflected while recording the appearance. It is also

pointed out that respondent no.2 was present then with her advocate namely Tejas Hilage. Accordingly we mention the appearance of Advocate Tejas Hilage with respondent no. 2 and appearance shown in the order be corrected accordingly.

4. Order be corrected accordingly.

(REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.)

(B.P. DHARMADHIKARI, J.)