



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 390 OF 2025

ANSARI AKHLAQUE AHMAD ABDUL HAMID AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for Applicants : Mr. R. C. Bora h/f Mr. Y. M. Khan
APP for Respondent-State : Ms. P. R. Bharaswadkar
...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, JJ.**

Dated : August 1, 2025

ORDER :-

1. Learned Advocate for applicants is absent. Learned Advocate Mr. R. C. Bora holding for Advocate for the applicants submits that the matter is settled. However, the respondent No. 3 could not remain present. He seeks accommodation to get the respondent No. 3 before the learned Registrar (Judicial) of this Court.

2. We are absolutely not happy with the things. We had dismissed the application on 17.03.2025. However, by filing Application No. 1280 of 2025 for recalling and by our detailed order dated 25.04.2025, we recalled the same order. On that day, the statement was made by the learned Advocate for the applicants

and the respondent No. 2 that there is a compromise and they want to produce the same on record. With their consent, the date that was fixed was 08.05.2025 to remain present before the learned Registrar (Judicial) for verification. On 16.06.2025, it was informed that the health of informant is not good and therefore, she could not remain present before the learned Registrar (Judicial). A specific statement was made that now her health is good and she can appear and therefore, extension was sought for the verification of compromise. Thereafter, we asked the learned Registrar (Judicial) to get the verification done on 20.06.2025.

3. The learned Registrar (Judicial) reports that neither the Advocate for the applicants nor the applicants were present on that day. Respondent No. 3 was absent. However, her Advocate was present. It was also stated that no terms of settlement are filed on record. That means, the Advocate for the applicants and the parties have taken this Court for a ride and they have no intention to place the terms of compromise on record.

4. We do not want to exercise our powers under Section 482 of CrPC for such persons, inspite of grant of time to place the terms of compromise on record and every benefit has been given

or the luxury has been given as per the convenience of the parties. Yet, the parties are not acting and therefore, we dismiss the application. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

[SANJAY A. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

Omkar Joshi