



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

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 6 OF 2006

KU. RAJSHREE BHAGWAN KALE
VERSUS
KISHOR NAVNATH KALE AND ANOTHER

...
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. B. R. Sontakke Patil
Advocate for Respondent No.1 : Ms. Pooja S. Ingle
holding for Mr. S. J. Salunk
APP for Respondent No.2 : Mr. S. R. Wakale
...

CORAM : S. G. MEHARE, J.

DATE : 10-07-2024

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant, the learned counsel for respondent No.1 and the learned A.P.P. for respondent No.2.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant and respondent No.1 were relatives. He learnt from reliable sources that the accused wanted to maintain the relationship. The victim has been married and living peacefully at her matrimonial home. The counsel also learned from his sources that she is not contacting him since she does not want to proceed with the matter. The petition is against the acquittal, and there is no scope for interference. Therefore, an appropriate order should be passed.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent/accused has no instructions.

4. In view of the statement made by the learned counsel for the applicant, the matter became *infructuous* as the victim did not want to proceed with the matter. The accused has already been acquitted in 2005. Due to the passage of time, the possibility of not prosecuting the complainant cannot be ruled out. There appears to be no substance in the revision, as the victim herself does not want to proceed with the matter.

5. Hence, the criminal revision application stands dismissed.

6. R & P be returned to the learned trial Court.

(S. G. MEHARE)
JUDGE

rrd