

|                              |     |             |
|------------------------------|-----|-------------|
| Yogesh Shantilal Mehta       | ... | Petitioner  |
| versus                       |     |             |
| Mihir Ashok Chhadva and Anr. | ... | Respondents |

Ms. Chhaya More h/f Mr. Anil Agarwal, for Petitioner.  
Mr. Rahul Hande with Ms. Prajakta Khedekar, for Respondent No.1.  
Mr. P.P.Malshe, APP for State.

**CORAM: N.J.JAMADAR, J.**

**DATE : 27 NOVEMBER 2025**

P.C.

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.
2. The challenge in this Petition is to an order dated 25 April 2024, passed by the learned Magistrate on an application filed by the accused – Respondent No.1 seeking production of the documents.
3. The impugned order reads as under :

“Perused the application, say and record of the case. The complainant is directed to take notice and produce of documents, as sought by the accused.”

4. Evidently, the impugned order singularly lacks reasons. Learned Magistrate has not at all adverted to the relevant issues that arise for consideration. As the Respondent No.1 – accused seeks production of the documents, learned Magistrate ought to have given reasons in support of the

impugned order. In the absence of reasons, which are the soul of the decision making process, the impugned order cannot be sustained.

5. Hence, the Writ Petition stands allowed.

6. The impugned order stands quashed and set aside.

7. The Application (Exh.19) stands restored to the file of the learned Magistrate for afresh decision.

8. Learned Magistrate is requested to decide the application (Exh.19) afresh, after providing an effective opportunity of hearing and recording brief reasons.

**( N.J.JAMADAR, J. )**