

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

Criminal Writ Petition No.3323 of 2024

Yashraj Films Pvt. Ltd.

Through its authorised representative

Mr Ramnarayanan Ramaswamy,

Age 52, having its address at 5,

Shah Industrial Estate, Veera

Desai Road, Andheri (East),

Mumbai 400 053.

... Petitioner

versus

1. The Entertainment Hub,
a Partnership Firm having
its registered office at 9th floor,
Bhukhanvala Chambers, B28,
Veera Industrial Estate,
off New Link Road, Andheri (W),
Mumbai – 400 053.

2. Kamlesh Bhanushali,
Partner of The Entertainment Hub
Having his address at 9th floor,
Bhukhanvala Chambers, B28,
Veera Industrial Estate,
Off New Link Road, Andheri (W),
Mumbai – 400 053.

3. Harish Patil
Partner of The Entertainment Hub
Having his address at 9th floor,
Bhukhanvala Chambers, B28,
Veera Industrial Estate,

Off New Link Road, Andheri (W),
Mumbai – 400 053.

4. State of Maharashtra

... Respondents

Mr Siddhant Vakil, along with Ms Riti Gada, i/b. Dua Associates, for the petitioner.

Mr Swapnil S Pednekar, APP, for respondent No.4/ State.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.
Date: 10 March 2025.

P.C.:

By this petition, the petitioner (complainant) seeks to challenge the order dated 3 March 2024 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 44th Court, Andheri, Mumbai, in CC No.4966/SS/2015, whereby respondents No.1 to 3 (accused) were acquitted in light of the compromise before the Lok Adalat.

2. Heard Mr Siddhant Vakil, the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, and Mr Swapnil Pednekar, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing respondent No.4/ State.

3. The main thrust of the petitioner's dissatisfaction relates to the learned Magistrate conducting the proceedings in the petitioner's absence. It is asserted that the learned Magistrate documented the petitioner's presence and recorded that the

matter was resolved in Lok Adalat, culminating in the acquittal of respondents No.1 to 3.

4. Upon reviewing the records, it transpires that the petitioner, accompanied by its Advocate, appeared before the Lok Adalat on 3 March 2024. On that day, the petitioner's authorised representative filled the requisite award form and affixed his signature, alongside its Advocate, in the presence of the constituted panel and the respondents, thereby confirming the settlement reached between the parties. Additionally, a perusal of the impugned order reveals that the petitioner was present in the Court when the compromise was formally accepted and the accused were acquitted. The records do not reflect any absence of the petitioner from the proceedings. In these circumstances, this Court finds that the petition lacks merits and stands dismissed accordingly.

(R.N. Laddha, J.)