

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 3990 OF 2023

Mahadeo Anandrao MahimanPetitioner
Versus
The State of Maharashtra and Anr.Respondents

Mr. Ditendra Mishra - Advocate for the Petitioner.
Smt. M. M. Deshmukh - APP for the Respondent-State.

**CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL &
S.M. MODAK, JJ.**

DATE : 17th MARCH 2025

P.C. :

1. This matter is placed for Speaking to the Minutes for correcting the typographical error in the paragraph no. 1 of the order dated 18.02.2025, wherein the C.R. No. 137 of 2017 of Khed Police Station is mentioned. The correct number is C.R. No. 135 of 2017, as it can be seen from the copy of the F.I.R. annexed to this petition. This is a typographical error.

2. Therefore, the first paragraph be corrected. The 'C.R. No. 135 of 2017' be mentioned instead of 'C.R. No. 137 of 2017'. Rest of the

order shall remain as it is. The corrected order be uploaded accordingly.

(S.M. MODAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)

CORRECTED ORDER DATED 18.02.2025 BE READS THUS:

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.3990 OF 2023

Mahadeo Anandrao Mahiman and Anr. ...Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Anr. ...Respondents

Mr.Ditendra Mishra – Advocate for Petitioners.

Smt.M.M.Deshmukh – APP for Respondent No.1 – State.

Mr.Prerith Menon – Advocate for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL &
S.M.MODAK, JJ.**

DATE : 18th FEBRUARY 2025

P.C. :

1. This is a Petition for quashing of the F.I.R. registered vide C.R. No.135 of 2017 registered at Khed Police Station – Ratnagiri on 5th June 2017.

2. The Investigating Agency after investigation had filed “A Summary Report” before the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class – Khed. The Magistrate had passed an order on 16th July 2019 wherein it is clearly mentioned, that there was no evidence collected by the Police and therefore, the “A Summary” was accepted. Therefore, nothing survives against the Petitioners. In spite of that, the present Petition is filed for the quashing of the F.I.R.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioners submitted, that in this view of the matter, he may be permitted to withdraw this Petition. He prays for withdrawal of this Petition.

4. Permission is granted. The Petition is allowed to be withdrawn. It is clarified, that if, in future, the Investigating Agency decides to take steps against the Petitioners, in connection with the same subject matter, the Petitioners would be at liberty to adopt appropriate legal proceedings.

5. With these observations and liberty, the Petition is allowed to be withdrawn, and is disposed of.

(S.M.MODAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)