



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1189 OF 2025

AU SMALL FINANCE BANK LTD THROUGH RAHUL RAMESHRAO PUND

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

APP for Respondent No. 1 : Mr. S.S. Dande

...

CORAM : ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.

DATE : 17TH DECEMBER, 2025

PER COURT :

1. None appears for the petitioner when the matter is called out.

2. Perused the record. It appears that on 04.11.2025, at the request of the petitioner, the matter was adjourned. On 19.11.2025, again at the request of the petitioner, the matter was adjourned. Then, on 12.12.2025, none appeared for the petitioner. Therefore, it was kept today with the specific observation that, if the petitioner fails to work out the matter, it will proceed on its own merits. Despite the foregoing facts, no one appears on behalf of the petitioner.

3. Perused the impugned order and record. At the outset, it appears that by this petition, the petitioner is seeking the relief to quash clause no. 5 of the operative part of the impugned order dated 19.10.2024. I would like to reproduce *clause no. 5* of the impugned order as under :

“Applicant shall not dispose of it and that he shall not change the nature of the car in any manner till the trial is concluded.”

4. A bare perusal of the impugned order reveals that the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Biloli, has returned the car in question to the petitioner. However, the condition imposed is that he shall not dispose of it or change the nature of the car in any manner until the trial is concluded.

5. I do not find any illegality or perversity in the impugned order or in the imposing condition of clause no. 5 in the impugned order.

6. Having considered the same, I do not find merit in the application. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as devoid of merit. No order as to costs.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)