



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1597 OF 2025

Rohit Nitin Hatangale & Ors.

...Applicants

Versus

Nayan Rohit Hatangale

...Respondent

Mr. Chormal Ajit B., Advocate for the Applicants

Mr. B. D. Shelke, Advocate for the Respondent.

CORAM : ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.

DATE : DECEMBER 16, 2025

PER COURT :

1. The learned counsel for the respondent submitted that, in terms of the undertaking given by her before this Court on 02nd December, 2025, the respondent had filed a pursis (Exhibit 11) on 09th December, 2025 before the learned Magistrate, stating that she does not wish to proceed against respondent Nos.3 to 6, i.e., applicant No.3 and three others, accordingly, a prayer was made for deletion of their names from the from the array of the respondents.

2. The learned counsel for the respondent has produced a copy of the pursis, on which the learned Magistrate has passed the order “*seen and filed.*” The same is taken on record and marked “X” for identification purposes.

3. Pursuant to the said Pursis, the learned Magistrate has passed an order below Exhibit 1 deleting the names of respondent Nos. 3 to 6

therein, which include applicant No.3 herein. The same is reflected in the Roznama dated 09th December 2025 of the learned Magistrate, obtained from the official website of the District Court (CIMS). The said Roznama is taken on record and marked “Y” for identification purposes.

4. It also appears that on 07th May 2025, the learned counsel for the applicants, on instructions, seeks leave to withdraw the application to the extent of applicant No.1 – Rohit. Similarly, today, the learned counsel for the applicants, on instructions, seeks leave to withdraw the application to the extent of the application of applicant No. 2 – Laxmi. His statement is accepted.

5. In view of the aforesaid statements, the application is dismissed qua applicant Nos. 1 and 2.

6. It further emerges that the application against applicant No.3 and three other persons has already been withdrawn, and their names have been deleted from the proceedings; therefore, the present application has become infructuous qua those persons.

8. In view of the above, the application is dismissed qua applicant Nos. 1 and 2, and the application stands disposed of against applicant No.3 as infructuous.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)