

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**

**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.411 OF 2015**

**RAJSHREE MANIK SARODE**

**)...APPELLANT**

**V/s.**

**THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANR. )...RESPONDENTS**

None for the Appellant.

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

**CORAM : A. M. BADAR, J.**

**DATE : 4<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2019**

**P.C. :**

1 This is an appeal challenging acquittal of the respondent no.2 of the offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act.

2 None appeared for the appellant. The Registry has reported that the respondent no.2, who happens to be the contesting respondent, could not be served. Perusal of the report

of the Serving Officer shows that the respondent no.2 is not residing at the address given by the appellant. No steps are taken by the appellant to serve the contesting respondent.

3           The learned counsel appearing for the appellant was absent in past also. It is, thus, seen that the appellant has lost interest in prosecuting the instant appeal.

4           The appeal is, therefore, dismissed for want of prosecution.

**(A. M. BADAR, J.)**