



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 61 OF 2024

SIDDHESHWAR DILIP WADEKAR AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Advocate for Applicants : Mr. A. S. Shejwal
APP for Respondents-State : Mr. S. M. Ganachari

...

...

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

Date : September 11, 2025

ORDER :-

1. The applicants raises an exception to the order dated 04.01.2024 rendered by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Beed, in Sessions Case No. 64 of 2023, rejecting the application for discharge presented under Section 227 of Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter "CrPC" for short).

2. The informant Dhondiram Dadarao Hatangale, Valve Man, Water Supply Department, Municipal Council, Beed, lodged the FIR on 11.12.2022 that while discharging the official duties, applicants have obstructed him and thereafter, slapped, abused and threatened to kill on the count of delay in supplying the water. Resultantly, applicants are facing the prosecution for the offences

punishable under Sections 353, 323, 504 and 506 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code (hereinafter "IPC" for short).

3. The learned counsel for applicants submits that there is nothing brought on record to indicate and establish prima facie involvement of the applicants to prosecute under Section 353 of IPC. There is delay in lodging the FIR. The applicants are involved in false case with an ulterior motive to harass. Hence, prayed to allow the application.

4. Per contra, the learned APP supported the order under challenge and prayed for rejection of the revision application.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for litigating sides and perusal of entire record, clearly establishes and indicates the complicity of the present applicants in the crime. The record further establishes that the present applicants have obstructed the complainant while he was discharging his official duties.

6. In that view of the matter, prima facie, there appears sufficient grounds exists to proceed against the applicants. The FIR specifically and clearly details the roles attributed against each of the applicants. These aspects are taken into account by the learned

Additional Sessions Judge while rejecting the application for discharge.

7. In view of the above, no case is made out to cause interference in the well reasoned order rendered by the learned Additional Sessions Judge.

8. Resultantly, present revision application *sans* merit and accordingly, the same stands **dismissed**.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)

Omkar Joshi