

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

REVISION APPLICATION NO. 383 OF 2003

Narayan Ramchandra Mali

...Applicant

vs.

Harischandra Bandu Tokade and Ors.

...Respondents

Ms. Shilpa S. Pawar	Appointed Advocate for the Applicant
Mr. Sudip Mallick a/w Ms. Farzana Khan i/by Mr. Harshad E. Palwe	Advocate for the Respondent No. 1
Mr. A. D. Kamkhedkar	APP for the Respondent-State

CORAM : S. M. MODAK, J.

DATE : 04th APRIL 2024

P. C. :-

1. Heard learned Advocate Ms. Pawar appointed for the Applicant-first informant, learned Advocate for the Respondent No. 1 and learned APP.

2. Read the Order dated 14/03/2024. Learned APP Shri Kamkhedkar has clarified that State has not preferred an appeal against judgment of the acquittal. This is submitted on the basis of the record which is available with the Office of the Public Prosecutor and with all

his persuasion, he could trace it out.

3. In the year 2003, remedy of an appeal to the first informant was not available and that is why this revision is filed. As submitted on 14/03/2024, by learned Advocate for the Applicant that Applicant wants to withdraw the revision. Today copy of the letter sent by the Applicant through Whats app addressed to learned Advocate is taken on record. It is not legible, but it is clear that he does not want to prosecute the revision. It is taken on record and marked as 'Annexure-X'.

4. In view of that the revision is disposed of as not pressed.

5. Learned appointed Advocate Ms. Pawar be paid fees as per the Rules.

[S. M. MODAK, J.]