

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 4600 OF 2023  
IN  
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 519 OF 2008

Tanaji Bhagwan Ghorpade ...Applicant

**In the matter between:-**

Keshav Ramchandra Narvekar ...Applicant

vs.

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

WITH  
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 4599 OF 2023  
IN  
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 520 OF 2008

Tanaji Bhagwan Ghorpade ...Applicant

**In the matter between:-**

Keshav Ramchandra Narvekar ...Applicant

vs.

Udaykumar Tejraj Gandhi and Ors. ...Respondents

\*\*\*\*\*

|                                  |                                                              |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr.S.M.Bhavar i/b. Mr.V.M.Mali:- | Advocate for Applicant in both Interim Applications.         |
| Mr.Pranay P. More:-              | Advocate for Applicant in both Revision Applications and for |

|                 |                                                           |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
|                 | Respondent in Both Interim Applications.                  |
| Mr.V.N.Sagare:- | APP for Respondent – State in both Revision Applications. |

\*\*\*\*\*

CORAM : S. M. MODAK, J.

DATE : 23<sup>rd</sup> APRIL 2024P. C. :-

1. Heard learned Advocate for the Applicant / First – Informant and learned Advocate for the Respondent / Accused No.2 and learned APP.
2. Let copy of this Application be served on learned APP.
3. The seized ornaments were returned to the Accused No.2 by the Court of JMFC. Whereas, there is modification in the said order by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge. Few of the ornaments were to be given to Accused No.2. Whereas, few are to be given to the First-Informant.
4. This part of the order is challenged on behalf of the First-Informant. These Applications are for early hearing. Certainly it can be taken but after vacation.

5. Hence, both Interim Applications are disposed of.
6. Hearing of the Revision is expedited.

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 520 OF 2008

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 519 OF 2008

7. When the prayer clause in both these Revisions are perused, it seems both are same. Learned Advocate appearing for the parties are unable to assist the Court why there are two Revision Applications.
8. Let them assist the Court on this aspect on the next date. However, hearing of both these Revision Applications is expedited. Stand over to **19<sup>th</sup> June 2024**. To be listed for “**Directions**”.

[S. M. MODAK, J.]