

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.4400 OF 2025

**SATISH
RAMCHANDRA
SANGAR**

Rahul Devmani Mishra

...Petitioner

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

Digitally signed by
SATISH RAMCHANDRA
SANGAR
Date: 2025.08.20
16:29:31 +0530

Mr.Dhavan Giri a/w Mr.Pratik Yadav and Ms.Prachi Yadav i/b. Mr.K.H.Giri:-	Advocates for Petitioner.
Mr.H.J.Dedhia:-	APP for Respondent – State.

CORAM : S. M. MODAK, J.

DATE : 14th AUGUST 2025

P. C. :-

1. Heard learned Advocate for the Petitioner / Accused and learned APP.

2. The only prayer is for issuing direction for expedite disposal of the Sessions trial No.452 of 2017. The charge is framed on 25th June 2018 for the offence punishable under Section 304 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (“**IPC**”) and under Section 185 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (“**MV Act**”). Its copy is on Page No.14. It is dated 25th June 2018.

After the charge, there are certain formalities to be completed prior to examining the witnesses. After the expiry of almost 6 years, list of witnesses is given on 2nd August 2024 and list of documents is also filed at Exhibit-11 on the same date. On 24th September 2024, there is endorsement in the roznama that the Accused has denied all the documents.

3. There is a procedure for giving notice as per Section 294 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (“Cr.P.C.”). The defense can be asked to admit the contents of particular document. If a particular document is admitted, the prosecution is relieved from the responsibility of proving that document. Even though earlier the Petitioner has denied all the documents, the Petitioner on the basis of legal advice can take a re-look to his decision. If the documents are not causing any prejudice to his defense, he can admit the same just like inquest panchnama.

4. After 24th September 2024, the matter is adjourned for 5-6 days for recording the evidence but unfortunately not a single witness is examined. It is true that the Court has to give a priority to the cases of ‘*undertrial prisoners*’ and the case in which there is a direction for ‘*expediting the hearing*’. This Court is not aware about the workload

before the Judge presiding over the Court Room No.10 but the fact that the case is pending since 2017 needs to be considered while fixing the board by the learned Judge. Let the learned Judge to make an attempt to dispose of the case as early as possible.

5. With these observations, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

[S. M. MODAK, J.]