

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 340 OF 2025

Rajaram Vithal Pawar

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Ors.

.... Respondents

Mr. Swaraj Jadhav (Through V.C.), Advocate for the Petitioner.

Dr. Ashvini Takalkar, A.P.P., for the Respondent – State.

Mr. Ranjeet Patil i/b Mr. Dhavalsinh Patil, Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 to 10.

Mr. N. B. Yadav, H.C. Kudal Police Station – Present.

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.

DATE : 9th SEPTEMBER, 2025.

SHANTANU
SHANKARSA
DHUDUM
Digitally signed
by SHANTANU
SHANKARSA
DHUDUM
Date: 2025.09.10
15:25:29 +0530

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner, learned APP for the Respondent – State and learned counsel for Respondent Nos.2 to 10.

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner has exposed the money laundering of Respondent Nos.2 to 10. Accordingly, offence registered against Respondent Nos.2 to 10. The offence was registered in the year 2014. Since, then the Respondent Nos.2 to 10 are dragging the matter. The Respondents to cross-examine by the Petitioner, but they did not cross-examined,

hence no cross order was passed against them, but the said order is set aside. Learned counsel further submitted that the Respondent Nos.2 to 10 are continuously threatening the Petitioner, as matter is more than 10 years old. Hence, direction be given to the trial Court to expedite the trial, and security be given to the Petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the Respondent Nos.2 to 10 submits that Respondent Nos.2 to 10 undertakes to attend the Court dates regularly. In their absence, their Advocates will cross-examine the prosecution witnesses. Learned counsel further submitted that direction be given to the Petitioner to remain present before the trial Court for giving evidence.

4. Learned APP submits that appropriate order be passed.

5. I have heard all learned counsel, perused the documents produced on record.

6. The offence was registered against Respondent Nos.2 to 10 in year 2014, the matter is going on since then. The matter is more than 10 years old. It appears from the record that no cross order was passed against Respondent Nos.2 to 10, thereafter, the order is set aside.

7. Considering the peculiar facts of the case, I pass following order:

ORDER

- i. The Respondent Nos.2 to 10 are directed to remain present before the trial Court regularly. In their absence, their Advocate shall cross-examine the prosecution witnesses. If prosecution witnesses remained to be cross-examined, without any reasonable ground the bail of the concerned accused shall be cancelled.
 - ii. If any adjournment application is filed by any accused on reasonable ground, the trial Court has authority to decide it on its own merit.
 - iii. The Petitioner shall attend the Court dates regularly for giving evidence, if he receives any threat, he can file appropriate application before the police.
 - iv. The trial Court is requested to dispose off the present trial as early as possible, preferably within six months, after receipts of this order.
8. In view of the above, the Writ Petition stands disposed off.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)