



( 1 )

17-WP-389-2025 STM

This order is speaking to minutes of order dated 15.07.2025.

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

**17 CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 389 OF 2025**

Rajdeep Publicity Pvt Ltd Through Authorized  
Director Rajesh Mannalal Katariya And Another ...Petitioners

**VERSUS**

Vijaykumar Fulchand Katariya ...Respondents

**WITH**

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 357 OF 2025**

**WITH**

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 369 OF 2025**

**WITH**

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 377 OF 2025**

**AND**

**18 CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 392 OF 2025**

Rajdeep Publicity Pvt Ltd Through Authorized  
Director Rajesh Mannalal Katariya And Another ...Petitioners

**VERSUS**

Mahesh Prakash Katariya ...Respondents

**WITH**

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 354 OF 2025**

**WITH**

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 365 OF 2025**

**WITH**

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 376 OF 2025**

**AND**

**19 CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 393 OF 2025**

Rajdeep Publicity Pvt Ltd Through Authorized Director Rajesh Mannalal  
Katariya And Another

**VERSUS**

Prakash Fulchand Katariya

This order is speaking to minutes of order dated 15.07.2025.

WITH  
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 351 OF 2025  
WITH  
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 364 OF 2025  
WITH  
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 383 OF 2025  
AND  
20 CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 394 OF 2025

Rajdeep Publicity Vt Ltd Through Authorized Director Rajesh Mannalal  
Katariya And Another

VERSUS

Aruna Vijaykumar Katariya

WITH  
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 366 OF 2025  
WITH  
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 378 OF 2025  
WITH  
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 384 OF 2025

...

Mr. Vinod Y. Bhide, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. Satyajeet Bora, Advocate h/f Mr. Karan V. Sarosiya, Advocate for the  
Respondent.

CORAM : KISHORE C. SANT, J.

DATE : 4<sup>th</sup> JULY 2025.

PC :-

1. Heard the parties.
2. The learned Advocate for the Respondent Mr. Satyajeet Bora fairly conceded that the learned Sessions Judge could not have decided the

question of maintainability of the applications which are still pending before the learned Magistrate in the trial Court.

3. Considering above, the impugned orders are set aside. The matters are remanded back to the Sessions Court.

4. The Sessions Court, Samgamner, is directed to decide the revision petition on its own merits, without touching the aspect of maintainability of the applications for amendment in the trial Court within three months from today.

5. The trial Court thereafter to decide the application on its own merit, if it survives.

**[KISHORE C. SANT, J.]**