



(1)

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

949 CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1064 OF 2019

**M/S. G.R. INFRA PROJECTS LTD. THROUGH ITS LICENING
MANAGER AND OTHERS**

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for the Petitioners : Ms. H.R. Lomte h/f Mr. Salunke V. D.

APP for Respondent-State : Mrs. A. S. Mantri

Advocate for Respondent No. 2 : Mr. More P. P.

...

CORAM : SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.

DATE : 24th DECEMBER 2025

P. C. :

1. Not on board. Mentioned. Taken on board.
2. This is a motion for speaking to the minutes of the order dated 18/12/2025. Learned Advocate for petitioners submits that vide the order dated 18/12/2025, this Criminal Writ Petition was disposed of by this Court, however, while disposing of the same, in paragraph No.4, inadvertently, a mistake of date is occurred as '04.08.1998'. It should be corrected as '**10.04.2019**' instead of '04.08.1998'.
3. Necessary correction be carried out accordingly and corrected order be uploaded.
- 4 This motion is, accordingly, disposed of.

[SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.]

shp

(2)

(This order dated 18.12.2025 stands corrected and uploaded in view of the order dated 24.12.2025 passed on the motion for Speaking to the Minutes of the order)

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

949 CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1064 OF 2019

**M/S. G.R. INFRA PROJECTS LTD. THROUGH ITS LICENING
MANAGER AND OTHERS**

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for the Petitioners : Ms. H. R. Lomte

h/f. Mr. Salunke V. D.

APP for Respondent-State : Mrs. A. S. Mantri

Advocate for Respondent No. 2 : Mr. More P. P.

...

CORAM : SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR J.,

DATE : 18.12.2025

PER COURT :

1. At the outset, Mr. Salunke, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he wants to avail the remedy available to her as per Section 397 of Cr.P.C. by filing Revision Application before the Sessions Court. But for that purpose, his time spent before this Court be considered for condoning the delay. In that view of the matter, present application sought to be withdrawn.

(3)

2. In that view of the matter the petition is disposed of as withdrawn.

3. However, the learned Sessions Court while considering the application for condonation of delay to keep in mind the fact that the petitioner was pursuing the matter before this Court. Hence, said application be considered sympathetically.

4. The effect of order dated **10.04.2019** to continue till the filing of the appeal.

5. The writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

(SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR)
JUDGE

shp/-