

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1137 OF 2023

Shobha Sanjay Talekar

...Petitioner

Versus

State Of Maharashtra

...Respondent

Mr. Lokesh Zade for Petitioner.

Mr. N.B. Patil APP, for the State/Respondent.

CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.

DATE : 7th JUNE, 2023.

PC. :

1. At the outset learned counsel for the Petitioner states on instructions that he is not pressing the prayer clause (a), which in effect was for permission to conduct the trial through the private advocate. Learned counsel is only pressing the prayer clause (b), wherein it is prayed that the trial be expedited and be made time bound.

2. Though the Petitioner has asked for the trial be directed to be concluded within a period of three months, it may not be possible for the trial Court to conclude the trial within a period of three months. However, the incidents are from year 2012. More than 10

years have passed and therefore, it would be in the interest of justice and in the interest of all the parties that some directions are given to conclude the trial in a reasonable period. Hence, the following order :

ORDER

- i. The Petition is considered only for prayer clause (b), as prayer clause (a) is not pressed by the learned counsel for the Petitioner.
- ii. The proceedings in RCC No.4815 of 2012 before the Court of Judicial Magistrate First Class, Court No.4, Pune are expedited and the learned trial Judge is requested to conclude the trial within a period of six months from today.
- iii. The prosecution as well as the accused are directed to co-operate with the Court in the endeavour to conclude the trial within that period.
- iv. With these observations, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)