

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 2336 OF 2013

Mr. Lalit s/o Chogalal Trivedi. ...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra. ...Respondents.

WITH

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 24 OF 2014
IN
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 2336 OF 2013

Mr. Ravindra Medsing. ...Applicant.

IN THE MATTER OF

Mr. Lalit s/o Chogalal Trivedi. ...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra. ...Respondents.

Mr. Akash A. Singh i/b. Mr. A.M. Saraogi, advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Omneel Jadhav i/b. Mr. Niranjana Mundargi, advocate for intervenor.

Shri K.V. Saste, APP for State.

**CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI &
SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV, JJ.**

DATE : NOVEMBER 8, 2019.

P.C.:

1 Counsel for the petitioner and counsel for intervenor are seeking time. Learned APP also states that he is awaiting instructions.

Talwalkar

2 In this Petition filed some time after 20th February, 2013, prayer is to transfer complaint of petitioner recorded vide statement dated 10th February, 2013 to any other senior officer and/or to a special team for investigation. This Court has not passed any operative order in the matter till date. Even formal notice has not been issued by this Court.

3 Papers show that very same petitioner had earlier filed Criminal Writ Petition No. 908 of 2013, which has been disposed of on 14th March, 2013. In that order, there is reference to still earlier petition i.e. Writ Petition No. 3666 of 2012, in which on 7/2/2013 High Court had directed the police officer to scribe a statement/report in the event, petitioner attended Dahisar Police Station and to proceed further in accordance with law. There Counsel for petitioner submitted that petitioner had attended police station on 10th February, 2013 and his statement was recorded. Grievance made was, no steps were taken though period of 4 weeks had passed.

4 While allowing the said Writ Petition No. 908 of 2013, this Court directed respondents to take further steps as per earlier order dated 7th February, 2013 within period of 4 weeks., if such steps were not already taken. Rule was accordingly made absolute.

Talwalkar

5 Thus, grievance made in present petition on the strength of statement recorded on 10th February, 2013 has been wiped out because of orders obtained by petitioners on 14th March, 2013 in Writ Petition No. 908 of 2013.

6 Writ Petition No. 2336 of 2013 is therefore disposed of as infructuous.

7 In view of this, intervention application is also disposed of.

(SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV, J) (B.P. DHARMADHIKARI, J)