



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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1085 OF 2024

Prashant S/o Shivaji Kurhe,
Age-38 years, Occu:Nil,
R/o-N-2, J-6-2, J-Sector,
Cidco, Mukundwadi, Aurangabad.

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

- 1) The State of Maharashtra,
- 2) Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Through its General Manager,
R/o-31-0, MIDC, Chikalthana,
Aurangabad,
- 3) Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Through its Manager,
R/o-31-0, MIDC, Chikalthana,
Aurangabad,
- 4) Yogesh Mannalal Agrawal,
Age-52 years, Occu:Managing Director,
R/o-Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai,
- 5) Rajesh Mannalal Agrawal,
Age-47 years, Occu: Jt. Managing Director,
R/o-Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai,
- 6) Satish Hanumant Agrawal,
Age-60 years, Occu:Asso. Vice President,
R/o-Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai,

- 7) Gopal S/o Nandkishor Rathi,
Age-70 years, Occu: Asso. Vice President,
R/o-Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai.

...RESPONDENTS

...
Ms. Karishma S. Sarin Advocate for Petitioner.
Mr. V.K. Kotecha, A.P.P. for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Rajendra S. Deshmukh, Senior Counsel i/by Mr. Rahul
Joshi Advocate and Mr. A.S. Gaikwad Advocate for Respondent
Nos. 2 to 7.

...

WITH

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.4128 OF 2024
[IN CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1085 OF 2024]

- 1) Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Through its General Manager,
Add:-31-0, MIDC Industrial Area,
Chikalthana, District Aurangabad 431210,
- 2) Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Through its Manager,
Add:-31-0, MIDC Industrial Area,
Chikalthana, District Aurangabad 431210,
- 3) Yogesh Agrawal,
Age-52 years, Occu:Managing Director,
Address:Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai-400067
- 4) Rajesh Agrawal,
Age-47 years, Occu: Joint Managing Director,
Address:Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai-400067,

- 5) Satish Agrawal,
Age-60 years, Occu:Assoc. Vice President,
Address:Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai-400067,
- 6) Gopal Rathi,
Age-70 years, Occu: Assoc. Vice President,
R/o-Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai-400067.

...APPLICANTS

VERSUS

- 1) Prashant S/o Shivaji Kurhe,
Age-38 years, Occu:Nil,
R/o-N-2, J-6-2, J-Sector,
Cidco, Mukundwadi, Aurangabad.

- 2) The State of Maharashtra

...RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. Rajendra S. Deshmukh, Senior Counsel i/by Mr. Rahul Joshi Advocate and Mr. A.S. Gaikwad Advocate for Applicants.
Ms. Karishma S. Sarin Advocate for Respondent No.1.
Mr. V.K. Kotecha, A.P.P. for Respondent No.2.

...

AND**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.609 OF 2024****WITH**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.4124 OF 2024]
[IN CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.609 OF 2024]

- 1) Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Through its General Manager,
Shri. Shantaram S/o Sakham Nemade,
R/o-31-0, MIDC Industrial Area,
Chikalthana, District Aurangabad 431210,

- 2) Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Through its Manager,
Shri Sunil S/o Rajaram Mahajan,
Age-54 years, Occu:Service,
R/o-31-0, MIDC Industrial Area,
Chikalthana, District Aurangabad 431210,
- 3) Yogesh S/o Mannalal Agrawal,
Age-52 years, Occu:Managing Director,
Address:Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai-400067
- 4) Rajesh S/o Mannalal Agrawal,
Age-47 years, Occu: Joint Managing Director,
Address:Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai-400067,
- 5) Satish S/o Hanumant Agrawal,
Age-60 years, Occu:Assoc. Vice President,
Address:Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai-400067,
- 6) Gopal S/o Nandkishor Rathi,
Age-70 years, Occu: Assoc. Vice President,
R/o-Ajanta Pharma Limited,
Ajanta House, Charkop,
Kandiwali West, Mumbai-400067.

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

- 1) The State of Maharashtra,
Through the Officer Incharge,
Police Station, MIDC, Cidco,
Aurangabad,
- 2) Prashant S/o Shivaji Kurhe,
Age-38 years, Occu:nil,
R/o-N-2, J-6-2, J-Sector,
Cidco, Mukundwadi, Aurangabad.

...RESPONDENTS

...
Mr. Rajendra S. Deshmukh, Senior Counsel i/by Mr. Rahul Joshi Advocate and Mr. A.S. Gaikwad Advocate for Petitioners in Criminal Writ Petition No.609 of 2024 and for Applicants in Criminal Application No.4124 of 2024.

Mr. V.K. Kotecha, A.P.P. for Respondent No.1 - State in both matters.

Ms. Karishma S. Sarin Advocate for Respondent No.2 in both matters.

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

DATE : 5th AUGUST, 2025

ORDER [PER SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.] :

1. Criminal Application No.4128 of 2024 has been filed in Criminal Writ Petition No.1085 of 2024 and Criminal Application No.4124 of 2024 has been filed in Criminal Writ Petition No.609 of 2024. As both these Applications have been filed for production of documents in respective Writ Petitions, Criminal Application No.4128 of 2024 and Criminal Application No.4124 of 2024 stand allowed.

2. Criminal Writ Petition No.1085 of 2024 and Criminal Writ Petition No.609 of 2024 are arising out of the same matter and therefore they are proposed to be disposed of by this common order.

3. Before turning to the submissions, the background leading to these Writ Petitions is required to be considered. The petitioner – informant in Writ Petition No.1085 of 2024 (hereafter referred to as “the petitioner Prashant”) had filed Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.1619 of 2022, before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Aurangabad for direction to send the matter for investigation under Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure contending that the accused persons named in the application have committed offence punishable under Sections 417, 420, 424, 426, 109, 276, 284, 504, 507 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code. By order dated 4th March 2024, the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, (Court No.5), Aurangabad allowed the said application. Immediately, the accused persons named therein had filed Criminal Revision Application No.81 of 2024 before the Sessions Court, Aurangabad on 11th March 2024. It appears that the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Aurangabad, had stayed the operation of the order passed by the learned Magistrate under Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The said order was dictated in the open Court by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Aurangabad on 16th March 2024, around 3.30 p.m., however, before the order could reach to the MIDC, Cidco

Police Station, Aurangabad, the FIR came to be registered at 15.47 Hours on the same day i.e. 16th March 2024 vide Crime No.128 of 2024. The accused persons named therein, had then approached this Court by filing Criminal Writ Petition No.609 of 2024, which we are finally deciding right now, and then this Court by order dated 1st April 2024, had stayed the further investigation into the crime till the revision is finally disposed of. Directions were given to the learned Sessions Judge to expedite the hearing of the revision and decide it as expeditiously as possible. Accordingly, Criminal Revision Application No.81 of 2024, came to be allowed on 16th May 2024 after hearing both the sides and the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Court No.5, Aurangabad in Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.1619 of 2022 on 4th March 2024, was quashed and set aside. Now, the petitioner Prashant has filed Criminal Writ Petition No.1085 of 2024 to challenge the order of the Revisional Court and Criminal Writ Petition No.609 of 2024 has been filed for quashment of the First Information Report (for short "the FIR") by the original accused.

4. Taking into consideration the background, we would proceed further to consider the rival contentions.

5. Heard learned Advocate Ms. Karishma Sarin appearing for the petitioner in Criminal Writ Petition No.1085 of 2024 and for respondent No.2 in Criminal Writ Petition No.609 2024, learned APP Mr. Kotecha appearing for respondent No.1 State in both the Petitions and learned Senior Counsel Mr. Rajendra Deshmukh instructed by Mr. Rahul Joshi Advocate and Mr. A.S. Gaikwad Advocate for the petitioners in Criminal Writ Petition No.609 of 2024 and for respondent Nos.2 to 7 in Criminal Writ Petition No.1085 of 2024.

6. Since the learned Revisional Court has allowed the Revision and set aside the order of learned Magistrate passed under Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, we directed the learned Advocate for the petitioner Prashant to argue first. She has taken us through the contents of the Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.1619 of 2022, documents attached, the order passed by the learned Magistrate on 4th March 2024 and also the order passed by the learned Revisional Court. She has submitted that the petitioner Prashant was the ex-employee of original accused No.1 company, Ajanta Pharma Limited. He is a qualified pharmacist. He had come to know about the irregularities and illegal activities in production in the company, on 1st February 2015. According to the petitioner Prashant,

respondent company is engaged in unfair mal-practices and unethical production of drugs without any license from the Central Government or the State Government. Therefore, he made complaint to the plant in-charge of Chikalthana factory, Mr. Nemade. As the petitioner Prashant was the qualified pharmacist, it was his duty and responsibility for certifying the drugs of the company and thereby he was involved in the process. When those illegalities and irregularities were noted, he had made the complaint. A meeting was also arranged with Mr. Gopal Rathi, who was the director of the company (accused No.6) and Vice President Mr. Satish Agrawal (accused No.5). However, there was absolutely no response from accused Nos. 5 and 6. On the contrary, the petitioner Prashant was threatened that if he acts with smartness, then he will have to loose his job or it would be open for the petitioner Prashant to leave the job. The petitioner Prashant was then harassed by the company management. Nobody had taken the complaint of the petitioner Prashant seriously. The company was producing Beta Lectum Antibiotics from 1990 to 2015, without any authorized license and was exporting it to Iraq. Proof for the said export is then available. The BIBA Multi Vitamin Syrup Batch No.0483A had failed in stability, still it was exported in the foreign countries by

the accused company. The documents to that effect have been personally seen by the petitioner Prashant. All the accused along with production manager and quality assurance officer were having knowledge about the same. The company has cheated the State as well as the Central Government and also to the Food and Drugs Administration. Even the Commissioner in Food and Drugs Administration or Inspector in the said department have not carried out their duties honestly. The accused company was also producing, manufacturing, packaging Ayurvedic, Allopathic and Beta Lactum in its Chikalthana plant. In fact it was not permitted as per the norms of the Food and Drugs Administration and guidelines of the Government. The Government guidelines show that there should be separate plant with all facilities. Further, various other products named in the application were produced in one plant only thereby even the hygiene and other things have not been followed. Ultimately then the petitioner Prashant has sent two notices through his Advocate to accused Nos.3 to 6. The accused persons simply denied the allegations. The illegal and unethical productivity of drugs was against the human beings and entire society and therefore, the petitioner Prashant was agitating it. When the petitioner Prashant tried to lodge police complaint, they refused

to take the same and therefore, he had approached the Police Commissioner, Aurangabad on 14th September 2021. The Police Commissioner has sent the said complaint to Cidco Police Station. Again it appears that the Inspector of the Police Station told that they cannot register the FIR against the accused and then it was stated that if the Court gives direction to the Police Authorities to make investigation then only they can investigate. The Police Authorities and accused persons pressurized the petitioner Prashant to withdraw the complaint on 26th November 2021.

7. Learned Advocate for the petitioner Prashant further submitted that all these facts were taken note of by the learned Magistrate and especially taking into consideration the decision in *Lalita Kumari vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others, (2014)2 SCC 1*, when Police had failed to take cognizance of the cognizable offence, had allowed the application and directed the Police to make investigation under Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The learned Revisional Court erred in allowing the Revision Application. It has been held that the guidelines in *Priyanka Srivastava vs. State of U.P., (2015) 6 SCC 287*, have not been followed by the learned Magistrate and there was total non-compliance of the mandatory provisions. In fact all

the mandatory provisions were complied with. The copy of the complaint which was given to the Commissioner of Police on 14th September 2021, was produced along with the Criminal Miscellaneous Application. Learned Revisional Court had further erred in observing that the petitioner Prashant has produced various documents on record showing that licenses to produce drugs were taken by Ajanta Pharma Company and the said licenses have been got renewed from time to time. Even as regards production of Beta Lectum is concerned, such license was produced by the complainant himself i.e. petitioner Prashant. All these documents were not considered by the learned Magistrate, are the observations and so also in respect of the observations regarding Drugs and Cosmetics Act, note was taken of Section 32 of the said Act, which specifies the authorities to initiate action. The cognizance of the same can be taken only by the Sessions Court and therefore the Magistrate's order was held to be illegal. In fact the learned Magistrate had considered the offences under the Indian Penal Code only and there was no question of involvement of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act. Therefore, the order passed by the learned Revisional Court is erroneous and deserves to be quashed and set aside.

8. Learned Advocate Ms. Sarin appearing for the petitioner Prashant, who is also respondent No.2 in Criminal Writ Petition No.609 of 2024, supported the order passed by the learned Magistrate and submitted that the said Writ Petition by the original accused persons deserves to be dismissed.

9. Learned Senior Counsel Mr. Deshmukh, instructed by learned Advocate Mr. Joshi for respondent Nos.2 to 7 in Criminal Writ Petition No.1085 of 2024 and the petitioners in Criminal Writ Petition No.609 of 2024, i.e. original accused persons submitted that the learned Revisional Court has correctly held that the mandatory provisions required to be followed as per the decision in ***Priyanka Srivastava vs. State of U.P.***, (supra), have not been followed. There was no such document produced by the petitioner Prashant to show that he had approached the concerned police station. The mandatory conditions under Section 154(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure have not been followed. Learned Senior Counsel, in support of his submissions, relied on the affidavit-in-reply of Shantaram Sakharam Nemade, General Manager of Ajanta Pharma Limited on behalf of respondent Nos.2 to 7 and submitted that even in Criminal Writ Petition No.1085 of 2024, the compliance has not been shown.

Under such circumstance, the decision by the Revisional Court is required to be upheld. Further, it can be seen that along with criminal application before the learned Magistrate the petitioner Prashant has filed those documents also which are the confidential documents of the company. The petitioner Prashant has not explained as to how he is having custody of those documents. The documents along with the application before the learned Magistrate shows that the production of Beta Lectum was approved by the officers of the Food and Drugs Administration from time to time. No irregularity or illegality was found. There was no question of ingredients of offence under Section 417, 420 of the Indian Penal Code as there was no delivery of any property. The licenses have been granted for production of Ayurvedic medicines also and it will have to be presumed that all the necessary steps or stages prior to the grant of licenses have been undergone as required under the law. Without going into the documents and without considering as to whether there is any such cognizable offence that is transpiring, the learned Magistrate had passed the order dated 4th March 2024 and therefore, on merits also the Revisional Court was justified in quashing the order passed by the learned Magistrate.

10. Though there appears to be the decision by the Revisional Court on two aspects i.e. one regarding non-compliance of the mandatory provisions under the guidelines of ***Priyanka Srivastava vs. State of U.P.***, (supra) and second is on merits, if we consider that the first ground is correct then we need not go into the second ground.

11. Before turning to the scrutiny of facts, therefore, we would like to consider the legal position. Certainly, we are guided by the decision in ***Priyanka Srivastava vs. State of U.P.***, (supra), when it comes to passing an order under Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, wherein it has been observed that :-

"27. In our considered opinion, a stage has come in this country where Section 156(3) Code of Criminal Procedure applications are to be supported by an affidavit duly sworn by the applicant who seeks the invocation of the jurisdiction of the Magistrate. That apart, in an appropriate case, the learned Magistrate would be well advised to verify the truth and also can verify the veracity of the allegations. This affidavit can make the applicant more responsible. We are compelled to say so as such kind of applications are being filed in a routine manner without taking any responsibility whatsoever only to harass certain persons.

That apart, it becomes more disturbing and alarming when one tries to pick up people who are passing orders under a statutory provision which can be challenged under

the framework of said Act or Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. But it cannot be done to take undue advantage in a criminal court as if somebody is determined to settle the scores.

We have already indicated that there has to be prior applications Under Section 154(1) and 154(3) while filing a petition Under Section 156(3). Both the aspects should be clearly spelt out in the application and necessary documents to that effect shall be filed. The warrant for giving a direction that an application Under Section 156(3) be supported by an affidavit so that the person making the application should be conscious and also endeavour to see that no false affidavit is made. It is because once an affidavit is found to be false, he will be liable for prosecution in accordance with law. This will deter him to casually invoke the authority of the Magistrate Under Section 156(3). That apart, we have already stated that the veracity of the same can also be verified by the learned Magistrate, regard being had to the nature of allegations of the case. We are compelled to say so as a number of cases pertaining to fiscal sphere, matrimonial dispute/family disputes, commercial offences, medical negligence cases, corruption cases and the cases where there is abnormal delay/laches in initiating criminal prosecution, as are illustrated in Lalita Kumari are being filed. That apart, the learned Magistrate would also be aware of the delay in lodging of the FIR."

12. In *Anurag Bhatnagar and another vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and another*, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1514, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had formulated five points and point No.1 was "(I) Whether an application under Section 156(3) of the CrPC could

have been filed without approaching the police authorities.” The relevant observations are thus:-

“21. Sub-section (3) of Section 154 CrPC lays down that if the information of a cognizable offence given to the officer-in-charge of the police station is not being recorded or is being refused to be recorded, the informant may send the substance of the said information to the Superintendent of Police concerned in writing and by post, who upon being satisfied that such information discloses a cognizable offence will either direct for the investigation of the offence or may himself investigate the same.

22. A plain and simple reading of Section 154 CrPC as a whole makes it imperative upon the informant to first approach the officer-in-charge of the police station for the purposes of lodging an FIR in respect of a cognizable offence and where the Police refuses to record such information, the remedy is to approach the concerned Superintendent of Police. It is only when no action is taken even by the Superintendent of Police and the information of commission of a cognizable offence is not being recorded by the officer-in-charge of the police station or even by the Superintendent of Police, that the person aggrieved or the informant may move the court of the Magistrate concerned to get the FIR registered and lodged with the concerned police station.

23.....

24.....

25.....

26. On a conspicuous reading of the provisions of Sections 154, 156 and 190 of the CrPC together, it is crystal clear that an informant who wants to report about a commission of a

cognizable offence has to, in the first instance, approach the officer-in-charge of the police station for setting the criminal law into motion by lodging an FIR. However, if such an information is not accepted by the officer-in-charge of the police station and he refuses to record it, the remedy of the informant is to approach the Superintendent of Police concerned. It is only subsequent to availing the above opportunities if he is not successful, he may approach the Magistrate under Section 156(3) CrPC for necessary action or of taking cognizance in accordance with Section 190 of the CrPC."

13. Further in *Anurag Bhatnagar and another vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and another*, (supra), it is observed in Para-29 that "It is well recognized in law that the person aggrieved must first exhaust the alternative remedies available to him in law before approaching the court of law. In other words, he cannot ordinarily approach the court directly." Thus, herein also it has been held that the directions in *Priyanka Srivastava vs. State of U.P.*, (supra), are mandatory.

14. Now, recently, in *S. N. Vijayalakshmi & Ors. vs. State of Karnataka & Anr.*, [Criminal Appeal No.____ of 2025 (@ Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No.8626 of 2024)], after taking note of the decisions including *Priyanka Srivastava vs. State of U.P.*, (supra), it has been observed thus :-

"We sum up our conclusions on this score as follows : (i)
Directions issued in *Priyanka Srivastava (Supra)* are

mandatory; (ii) Guidelines laid down in *Priyanka Srivastava (Supra)* operate prospectively; (iii) Non-filing of the supporting affidavit is a curable defect, but must be cured before the Magistrate passes any substantive order on the complaint/application, and; (iv) if the Magistrate proceeds without the requisite affidavit, such order/any consequential orders/proceedings can be quashed on the sole ground of non-compliance with *Priyanka Srivastava (Supra)*.”

15. Though this case was mainly in respect of non filing of FIR, yet the last is relevant for us in *Priyanka Srivastava vs. State of U.P.*, (supra), wherein it has been observed thus :-

“26. At this stage it is seemly to state that power under Section 156(3) warrants application of judicial mind. A court of law is involved. It is not the police taking steps at the stage of Section 154 of the code. A litigant at his own whim cannot invoke the authority of the Magistrate. A principled and really grieved citizen with clean hands must have free access to invoke the said power. It protects the citizens but when pervert litigations takes this route to harass their fellows citizens, efforts are to be made to scuttle and curb the same.”

16. Thus, taking into consideration all the above three pronouncements, it is to be seen as to whether in this case there was compliance. Along with the complaint application i.e. Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.1619 of 2022, the petitioner Prashant had not filed the complaint in writing

tendered by him to the Police Station. His oral report might not have been taken but he should have given the written complaint to M.I.D.C., Cidco Police Station. He directly approached the Commissioner of Police, Aurangabad, by filing application on 14th September 2021. Then he says that the Commissioner of Police had forwarded the said complaint to M.I.D.C. Cidco Police Station and thereafter he was called to the Police Station. But then he has given in writing to the Police Station that he has no complaint to make. Now, he is coming with the case that said document was taken forcibly from him as the police authorities and accused persons had pressurized him to withdraw the complaint. He has said that he has blindly signed on the *Samajpatra*, dated 26th November 2021, in the M.I.D.C. Police Station, Aurangabad. That means whatever application he has made to the Commissioner of Police on 14th September 2021, has been taken back by him. Thereafter, there was absolutely no efforts by the petitioner Prashant to file complaint application to the Police Station in writing and then to approach the Commissioner of Police once again before he had taken up the process in Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.1619 of 2022. In short, there was absolutely no compliance of Section 154(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Under such circumstance, the

order passed by the learned Magistrate on 4th March 2024 suffers from illegality. That order was rightly struck down by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Aurangabad on 16th May 2024 in Criminal Revision Application No.81 of 2024. The FIR bearing Crime No.128 of 2024, registered with M.I.D.C. Cidco Police Station, Aurangabad on 16th March 2024, therefore, deserves to be quashed and set aside.

17. As aforesaid, there is no necessity for this Court to go into the merits, as to whether the complaint application i.e. Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.1619 of 2022 was disclosing any cognizable offence or not. It would be otherwise wastage of time and increasing unnecessarily length of the Judgment.

18. For the above reasons, we proceed to pass following order:-

ORDER

(I) Criminal Application No.4128 of 2024 and Criminal Application No.4124 of 2024, for production of documents, stand allowed.

(II) Criminal Writ Petition No.1085 of 2024 stands dismissed.

(III) Criminal Writ Petition No.609 of 2024 stands allowed.

(IV) The First Information Report vide Crime No.128 of 2024, registered with M.I.D.C. Cidco Police Station, Aurangabad, on 16th March 2024, for the offence punishable under Sections 417, 420, 424, 426, 109, 276, 504, 507 of the Indian Penal Code, stands quashed and set aside as against petitioner Nos. 1 to 6 i.e. - 1) Ajanta Pharma Limited, Through its General Manager, Shri. Shantaram S/o Sakharam Nemade, 2) Ajanta Pharma Limited, Through its Manager, Shri Sunil S/o Rajaram Mahajan, 3) Yogesh S/o Mannalal Agrawal, 4) Rajesh S/o Mannalal Agrawal, 5) Satish S/o Hanumant Agrawal and 6) Gopal S/o Nandkishor Rathi.

[SANJAY A. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE