



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 74 OF 2025

APPLICANT : Anup Niranjan Dodiya,
Aged about 40 years, Occu: Business,
R/o Ratanlal Plot Square, Akola,
Tq. and District Akola.

-VERSUS-

NON-APPLICANT State of Maharashtra,
Through Police Station Officer,
Police Station Badnera,
District Amravati.

Mr. R.M.Daga, counsel with Mr. Abhinandan V. Karnavat, counsel
for applicant.
Ms. T.H. Udeshi, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM : **URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.**
DATE : **17/07/2025**

ORAL JUDGMENT :

1. Heard learned counsel Mr. R.M. Daga for the applicant, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the Non-applicant/State. **Rule.** Heard finally with consent of learned counsels appearing for the parties.

2. The present revision application is filed by the applicant, who is the original accused in connection with Crime No. 566/2018 registered under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 with the non-applicant/police station against the rejection of discharge application filed below Exhibit-6 under Section 227 of the Cr.P.C.

3. The factual matrix of the case are as under;

The brother of the deceased Mangesh Ashokrao Khandare has lodged a report on 26/09/2018, on an allegation that his elder brother Bhagyesh was having money transaction with the present applicant. He was running a shop by name Patil Automobiles, and deceased has given some hand loan to the present applicant and present applicant has not repaid the same. As the amount was not received by the deceased, and on that count, there was harassment at the hands of the present applicant and therefore, deceased has committed suicide on 26/09/2018 by hanging himself. On the basis of the said report, police have registered the crime against the present applicant.

4. Initially, an Accidental Death (A.D.) report was registered, and during the inquiry, the inquiry officer conducted an

inquest report. The dead body of the deceased was also forwarded to the Post Mortem examination. Thereafter, as brother of the deceased has lodged a report therefore, crime was registered. During the investigation, the Investigating Officer has visited the spot of incidence and drawn the spot panchanama and recorded the various statements of the witnesses, suicide note was also seized in presence of panchas and forwarded to the hand-writing expert. After completion of the investigation, the charge-sheet was submitted against the accused. After completion of the investigation, a charge-sheet was submitted, and the case was committed to the Court of Sessions. The applicant then preferred an application under Section 227 of the Cr.PC., on the contention that the entire investigation papers, nowhere shows nexus between the harassment and ill-treatment and committal of the suicide by the deceased, and therefore, no prima-facie case is made out to frame the charge against him, and requested to discharge him from the offences.

5. The said application came to be rejected by the Additional Sessions Judge holding that there was a prima-facie material against the present applicant, and hence this revision.

6. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, who reiterated that there is no nexus between the ill-treatment or the harassment at the hands of the present applicant and suicide by the deceased. He invited my attention towards the inquest panchanama and submitted that during the inquiry of the accidental death, the inquiry officer has drawn the inquest panchanama and the complainant was present at the time of the inquest panchanama, he has not uttered any single word as to the harassment at the hands of present applicant. Subsequently, afterthought this complaint came to be lodged. Thereafter, he also submitted that the present applicant has filed a complaint against the brother of the deceased under Section 138 of the N.I. Act and the complainant was convicted. Having grudge against the present applicant, this false FIR is lodged with baseless allegation.

7. He further invited my attention towards the fact that the present complainant has made a complaint against the present applicant to the Sub-Registrar, Cooperative Societies, alleging that present applicant is involved in the illegal money lending. After inquiry by the Sub-Registrar, the finding recorded by the Sub-Registrar, that from the inquiry, it nowhere reveals that it was

the present applicant who was involved in the illegal money lending business. He also invited my attention towards the various statement recorded by the Investigating Officer and submitted that, none of the statements discloses that there was a harassment to such extent that the deceased was not having any alternative but to commit suicide, and therefore he has committed suicide.

8. He submitted that to attract Section 306 of the IPC, two basic ingredients that an act of suicide by one person and abetment by another person are to be established. In order to sustain a charge under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, it must necessarily be proved that the accused person has contributed to the suicide by the deceased by some direct or indirect act. Abetment involves a mental process of instigating or intentionally aiding another person to do a particular thing. To bring a charge under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, the act of abetment would require the positive act of instigating or intentionally aiding another person to commit suicide. Without such *mens rea* on the part of the accused person being apparent from the face of the record, a charge under the aforesaid Section cannot be sustained.

9. In support of his contention, he placed reliance on the order of this Court in *Criminal Revision Application No. 207/2024 (Ku. Karishma d/o Vijay Sharma Vs State of Maharashtra decided on 08/07/2025)* and *Criminal Revision Application No. 174/2024 (Vaibhav s/o Premanand Mawale Vs State of Maharashtra decided 15/01/2025)*. In addition to that, he placed reliance on the case of *Kumar @ Shiva Kumar Vs State of Karnataka in Criminal Appeal No. 1427 of 2011 Decided on 01/03/2024 Supreme Court*; and *Jayedeesinh Pravinsinh Chavda and others State of Gujarat [Arising out of SLP(Crl.) 7957 of 2024] decided on 10/12/2024*, and submitted that in all judgments, the principle regarding the material which is required to establish the charge under Section 306 of IPC is reiterated.

10. Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State submitted that at the time of framing of charge, a strong suspicion is also sufficient to frame charge. Whether there was requisite *mens-rea* or not is a matter of evidence. The statements of witnesses, who are friends of the deceased, and the suicide note disclose the involvement of the present applicant in the alleged offence. She further submitted that from the recitals of

the suicide note itself, it reveals that there was no alternative before the deceased but to commit suicide, as there was harassment to such an extent that he could not find out any other way, and therefore he committed suicide. Thus, at this stage, the material collected during the investigation is sufficient to frame the charge, and therefore, no interference is called for.

11. Before entering into merits of the case, it is necessary to see what are considerations for considering the application for discharge.

12. It is a settled principle of law that at the stage of considering an application for discharge, the court must proceed on the assumption that the material which has been brought on record by the prosecution is true and evaluate the material in order to determine whether the facts emerging from the material, taken on its face value, disclose the existence of the ingredients necessary of the offence alleged.

13. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***State of Gujarat vs. Dilipsinh Kishorsinh Rao, reported in MANU/SC/1113 2023***, advertent to the earlier propositions of law in its earlier decisions in the cases of ***State of Tamil Nadu vs. N.Suresh Rajan***

and ors, reported in (2014) 11 SCC 709 and *the State of Maharashtra vs. Som Nath Thapa, reported in (1996) 4 SCC 659* and *The State of MP Vs. Mohan Lal Soni, reported in (2000) 6 SCC 338*, has held as under:

*“10. It is settled principle of law that at the stage of considering an application for discharge the court must proceed on an assumption that the material which has been brought on record by the prosecution is true and evaluate said material in order to determine whether the facts emerging from the material taken on its face value, disclose the existence of the ingredients necessary of the offence alleged. This Court in **State of Tamil Nadu vs. N.Suresh Rajan and ors, (2014) 11 SCC 709** adverting to the earlier propositions of law laid down on this subject has held:*

"29. We have bestowed our consideration to the rival submissions and the submissions made by Mr. Ranjit Kumar commend us. True it is that at the time of consideration of the applications for discharge, the court cannot act as a mouthpiece of the prosecution or act as a post office and may sift evidence in order to find out whether or not the allegations made are groundless so as to pass an order of discharge. It is trite that at the stage of consideration of an application for discharge, the court has to proceed with an assumption that the materials brought on record by the prosecution are true and evaluate the said materials and documents with a view to find out whether the facts emerging therefrom taken at their face value disclose the existence of all the ingredients constituting the alleged offence. At this stage, probative value of the materials has to be gone into and the court is not expected to go deep into the matter and

hold that the materials would not warrant a conviction. In our opinion, what needs to be considered is whether there is a ground for presuming that the offence has been committed and not whether a ground for convicting the accused has been made out. To put it differently, if the court thinks that the accused might have committed the offence on the basis of the materials on record on its probative value, it can frame the charge; though for conviction, the court has to come to the conclusion that the accused has committed the offence. The law does not permit a mini trial at this stage."

14. Thus, the defence of the accused is not to be looked into at this stage when the application is filed for discharge. The expression "the record of the case" used in Section 227 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is to be understood as the documents and materials, if any, produced by the prosecution. The provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure does not give any right to the accused to produce any document at the stage of framing of the charge. The submission of the accused is to be confined to the material produced by the investigating agency. The primary consideration at the stage of framing of charge is the test of existence of a prima-facie case, and at this stage, the probative value of materials on record need not be gone into. At the stage of entertaining the application for discharge under Section 227 of the

Code of Criminal Procedure, the court cannot analyze or direct the evidence of the prosecution and defence or the points or possible cross examination of the defence. The case of the prosecution is to be accepted as it is.

15. In the case of *Union of India vs. Prafulla Kumar Samal and anr*, reported in (1973)3 SCC 4, the Hon'ble Apex Court considered the scope of Section 227 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. After adverting to the various decisions, the Hon'ble Apex Court has enumerated the following principles:

“(1) That the Judge while considering the question of framing the charges under section 227 of the Code has the undoubted power to sift and weigh the evidence for the limited purpose of finding out whether or not a prima facie case against the accused has been made out.

(2) Where the materials placed before the Court disclose grave suspicion against the accused which has not been properly explained the Court will be, fully justified in framing a charge and proceeding with the trial.

(3) The test to determine a prima facie case would naturally depend upon the facts of each case and it is difficult to lay down a rule of universal application. By and large however if two views are equally possible and the Judge is satisfied that the evidence produced before him while giving rise to some suspicion but not grave suspicion against the accused, he will be fully within his right to discharge the accused.

(4) That in exercising his jurisdiction under Section

227 of the Code the Judge which under the present Code is a senior and experienced Judge cannot act merely as a Post office or a mouth-piece of the prosecution, but has to consider the broad probabilities of the case, the total effect of the evidence and the documents produced before the Court, any basic infirmities appearing in the case and so on. This however does not mean that the Judge should make a roving enquiry into the pros and cons of the matter and weigh the evidence as if he was conducting a trial.”

16. Now, question remains, whether the evidence collected during the investigation is sufficient to say that the applicant abetted to commit suicide. From the entire charge-sheet, it reveals that the allegation is that there was a money transaction between the present applicant and the deceased. The present applicant has not repaid the amount, and deceased was not having any source and therefore, he fed up with the harassment at the hands of the present applicant, as he was not paying the amount after repeated demands and therefore, he committed suicide. The suicide note is also placed on record, which shows that as the deceased was frustrated as he was continuously unsuccessful in his work and the business, which he has started. Thereafter, he alleged that there is continuous harassment at the hands of the present applicant and therefore, he is committing suicide. The statements

of the witnesses also disclosed that there was a money transaction between the present applicant and the deceased. It is undisputed that out of money transaction one criminal proceedings under Section 138 of N.I. Act was filed by the present applicant against the brother of the deceased and the brother of the deceased is convicted in Summary Criminal Case no. 137 of 2015 by judgment dated 20/09/2023 passed by the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Akola. It is also not disputed that brother of the complainant made a complaint against the present applicant with the Sub-Registrar Cooperative Societies, alleging involvement in an illegal money lending business. The Sub-Registrar Cooperative Societies has conducted an inquiry as to the illegal money lending business allegedly carried out by the present applicant and finding was recorded that on the basis of the enquiry, it nowhere reveals that the present applicant was involved in an illegal money lending business.

17. In the light of the above said facts, it is necessary to see what are the ingredients of Section 306 of IPC.

18. Section 306 (Section 108 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023) of the Indian Penal Code defines abetment of

suicide, which reads thus:

306. Abetment of suicide. - *If any person commits suicide, whoever abets the commission of such suicide, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine.*

Classification of offence. - The offence under this section is cognizable, non-bailable, non-compoundable and triable by Court of Session.

19. Section 107 of the Indian Penal Code (Section 45 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023) defines abetment of a thing, which reads thus:

107. Abetment of a thing. A person abets the doing of a thing, who -

First.—Instigates any person to do that thing; or

Secondly.—Engages with one or more other person or persons in any conspiracy for the doing of that thing, if an act or illegal omission takes place in pursuance of that conspiracy, and in order to the doing of that thing; or

Thirdly.—Intentionally aids, by any act or illegal omission, the doing of that thing.

Explanation 1.—A person who, by willful misrepresentation, or by willful concealment of a material fact which he is bound to disclose, voluntarily causes or procures, or attempts to cause or procure, a thing to be done, is said to instigate the doing of that thing.

Illustration

A, a public officer, is authorised by a warrant from a Court of Justice to apprehend Z, B, knowing that fact and also

that C is not Z, wilfully represents to A that C is Z, and thereby intentionally causes A to apprehend C. Here B abets by instigation the apprehension of C.

Explanation 2.—Whoever, either prior to or at the time of the commission of an act, does anything in order to facilitate the commission of that act, and thereby facilitates the commission thereof, is said to aid the doing of that act.

20. Thus, Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code talks about abetment of suicide and states that whoever abets the commission of suicide of another person, he/she shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term not exceeding ten years and shall also be liable to fine.

The said Sections penalizes abetment of commission of suicide. To charge someone under this Section, the prosecution must prove that the accused played a role in the suicide. Specifically, the accused's actions must align with one of the three criteria detailed in Section 107 of the Indian Penal Code. This means the accused either encouraged or conspired with others to ensure the person committed suicide.

21. A question arises as to when a person said to have instigated another. The word “instigate” means to goad or urge

forward, provoke, incite or encourage to do “an act” which the person otherwise would not have done.

22. It is well settled that in order to amount to abetment, there must be mens rea. Without knowledge or intention, there cannot be any abetment. The knowledge and intention must relate to the act said to be abetted which in this case, is the act of committing suicide. Therefore, in order to constitute abetment, there must be direct incitement to do culpable act.

23. In *SLP (Cri.) Diary No.39981/2022 (Prabhu vs. The State represented by the Inspector of Police and anr) decided by the Hon'ble Apex Court on 30.1.2024*, it is held that the physical relationship over a considerable period of time was out of mutual love between the appellant and the deceased and not based on the promise of marriage. In the said case, the Hon'ble Apex Court has considered its earlier decision in the case of *Kamlakar vs. State of Karnataka (Criminal Appeal No.1485/of 2011, decided on 12.10.2023* and explained ingredients of Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code and held, as under:

"8.2. Section 306 IPC penalizes abetment of commission of suicide. To charge someone under this Section, the prosecution must prove that the accused played a role in

the suicide. Specifically, the accused's actions must align with one of the three criteria detailed in Section 107 IPC. This means the accused either encouraged the individual to take their life, conspired with others to ensure the person committed suicide, or acted in a way (or failed to act) which directly resulted in the person's suicide.

8.3. In *Ramesh Kumar vs. State of Chattisgarh*, reported in AIR 2001 SC 383, this Court has analysed different meanings of “instigation”. The relevant para of the said judgment is reproduced herein:

“20. Instigation is to goad, urge forward, provoke, incite or encourage to do “an act”. To satisfy the requirement of instigation though it is not necessary that actual words must be used to that effect or what constitutes instigation must necessarily and specifically be suggestive of the consequence. Yet a reasonable certainty to incite the consequence must be capable of being spelt out. The present one is not a case where the accused had by his acts or omission or by a continued course of conduct created such circumstances that the deceased was left with no other option except to commit suicide in which case an instigation may have been inferred. A word uttered in the heat of anger or emotion without intending the consequences to actually follow cannot be said to be instigation.”

8.4. The essentials of Section 306 IPC were elucidated by this Court in ***M.Mohan vs. State*, AIR 2011 SC 1238**, as under:

“43. This Court in *Chitresh Kumar Chopra v. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi)* [(2009) 16 SCC 605 : (2010) 3 SCC (Cri) 367] had an occasion to deal with this aspect of abetment. The Court dealt with the dictionary meaning of the word “instigation” and “goadings”. The Court opined that there should be intention to provoke, incite or encourage the

doing of an act by the latter. Each person's suicidability pattern is different from the others. Each person has his own idea of selfesteem and selfrespect. Therefore, it is impossible to lay down any straitjacket formula in dealing with such cases. Each case has to be decided on the basis of its own facts and circumstances.

44. Abetment involves a mental process of instigating a person or intentionally aiding a person in doing of a thing. Without a positive act on the part of the accused to instigate or aid in committing suicide, conviction cannot be sustained.

45. The intention of the legislature and the ratio of the cases decided by this Court are clear that in order to convict a person under Section 306 IPC there has to be a clear mens rea to commit the offence. It also requires an active act or direct act which led the deceased to commit suicide seeing no option and this act must have been intended to push the deceased into such a position that he/she committed suicide.”

8.5. The essential ingredients which are to be meted out in order to bring a case under Section 306 IPC were also discussed in ***Amalendu Pal alias Jhantu vs. West bengal AIR 2010 SC 512***, in the following paragraphs:

“12. Thus, this Court has consistently taken the view that before holding an accused guilty of an offence under Section 306 IPC, the court must scrupulously examine the facts and circumstances of the case and also assess the evidence adduced before it in order to find out whether the cruelty and harassment meted out to the victim had left the victim with no other alternative but to put an end to her life. It is also to be borne in mind that in cases of alleged abetment of suicide there must be proof of direct or indirect acts of

incitement to the commission of suicide. Merely on the allegation of harassment without there being any positive action proximate to the time of occurrence on the part of the accused which led or compelled the person to commit suicide, conviction in terms of Section 306 IPC is not sustainable.

13. In order to bring a case within the purview of Section 306 IPC there must be a case of suicide and in the commission of the said offence, the person who is said to have abetted the commission of suicide must have played an active role by an act of instigation or by doing certain act to facilitate the commission of suicide. Therefore, the act of abetment by the person charged with the said offence must be proved and established by the prosecution before he could be convicted under Section 306 IPC.”

8.6. On a careful reading of the factual matrix of the instant case and the law regarding Section 306 IPC, there seems to be no proximate link between the marital discord between the deceased and the appellant and her subsequent death by burning herself. The appellant has not committed any positive or direct act to instigate or aid in the commission of suicide by the deceased.”

24. Thus, a direct influence or an oblique impact with the acts or utterances of the accused caused or created in the mind of the deceased and which draw him to suicide will not be sufficient to constitute offence of abetment of suicide. A fatal impulse or ill-fated thoughts of the suicide, however unfortunate and touchy it may be, cannot fray the fabric of the provision contained in Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code. In order to bring out an

offence under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code specific abetment as contemplated by Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code on the part of the accused with an intention to bring about the suicide of the person concerned as a result of that abetment is required. The intention of the accused to aid or to instigate or to abet the deceased to commit suicide is a must for an offence under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code.

25. In addition to this, learned counsel for the applicant placed reliance in the case of *Kumar @ Shiva Kumar* referred (supra), wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has dealt with this aspect and by defining the Section 107 IPC and by referring the catena of decisions observed that human mind is an enigma. It is well nigh impossible to unravel the mystery of the human mind. There can be myriad reasons for a man or a woman to commit suicide or attempt to commit suicide. It may be a case of failure to achieve academic excellence, oppressive environment in college or hostel, particularly for students belonging to the marginalized sections, joblessness, financial difficulties, disappointment in love or marriage, acute or chronic ailments, depressions, so on and so forth. Therefore, it may not be always be the case that someone

has to abet commission of suicide. Circumstances surrounding the deceased in which he finds himself are relevant.

26. Learned counsel for the applicant relied upon the case of *Jayedeesingh Pravinsinh Chavda and others referred (supra)*, wherein also, after referring the various decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court is observed that mere harassment and such issues between the wife and her husband along with the in-laws do not appear to create a scenario where she was left with no option other than to end her life. There is, therefore, absence of mens rea to instigate suicide of the deceased persons. Therefore, prima-facie, it appears that the appellants did not have the requisite mens-rea and neither did they commit any positive or direct act or omission to instigate or aid in the commission of suicide by the deceased.

27. In *Mahendra Awase vs State of Madhya Pradesh reported in Supreme Court in Criminal Appeal No. 211/2025 (@Special Leave Petition (Crl.) No. 11868 of 2023) decided on 17/01/2025*, wherein on the similar facts, the Hon'ble Apex Court in para-19 observed as follows.

“19. Applying the above principle to the facts of the present case, we are convinced that there are no

grounds to frame charges under Section 306 IPC against the appellant. This is so even if we take the prosecution's case on a demurrer and at its highest. A reading of the suicide note reveals that the appellant was asking the deceased to repay the loan guaranteed by the deceased and advanced to Ritesh Malakar. It could not be said that the appellant by performing his duty of realising outstanding loans at the behest of his employer can be said to have instigated the deceased to commit suicide. Equally so, with the transcripts, including the portions emphasised hereinabove. Even taken literally, it could not be said that the appellant intended to instigate the commission of suicide. It could certainly not be said that the appellant by his acts created circumstances which left the deceased with no other option except to commit suicide. Viewed from the armchair of the appellant, the exchanges with the deceased, albeit heated, are not with intent to leave the deceased with no other option but to commit suicide. This is the conclusion we draw taking a realistic approach, keeping the context and the situation in mind. Strangely, the FIR has also been lodged after a delay of two months and twenty days.

28. In the light of the above principles enumerated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in various judgments. If the facts of the present case are taken into considerations, there is no dispute as to the money transaction between the present applicant and the deceased. From the suicide note, it reveals that deceased was demanding the money and the money was not returned. On the contrary, the criminal complaint filed by the present applicant against the brother of the deceased shows that, it was the brother

of the deceased who has to pay some amount and against the discharge and enforceable debt, he has issued the cheque in favour of the present applicant. The said cheque was deposited by the present applicant and it was dishonored, the criminal complaint was filed. On the basis of the evidence adduce, the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate hold the complaintant who is the brother of the deceased guilty and convicted him in the said criminal case. Thus, on the examination of the instance case on the touchstones of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the first suicide note written by the deceased victim and the circumstances, which are brought on record shows that the money transaction was there as well as the deceased was frustrated as he was unsuccessful in various business which he had started. Thus, there was no proximate or nexus appearing between the two acts i.e. the money transaction between the present applicant and the deceased. It is only, a case that, there was a money transaction and the deceased was demanding the money and present applicant allegedly has not paid the same. Thus, as far as the abetment is concerned, merely because the applicant was not paying the money itself would not amount to instigate or provoked the deceased, the victim commit suicide. At the most, what is

attributable to the applicant that the applicant was not responding to the demand of the deceased.

29. A plain reading of Sections 107, 108, and 306 of the Indian Penal Code and applying it to the undisputed facts of the present case indicates that none of ingredients are attracted to the case in hand.

30. After having sifted weigh through the evidence on record and gone through the investigation papers and considering the materials on record, it is difficult to hold that inference of grave suspicion can be raised against the applicant on the basis of the evidence on record. The material appears to be insufficient for subjecting the applicant to trial. On the basis of the evidence on record, it cannot be stated that the material is sufficient for the prosecution to establish the charge against the applicant. Merely because, the present applicant was not paying the amount as alleged by the complainant would not be sufficient to show that he has abetted the deceased to commit suicide. Subjecting the applicant to trial on the basis of the above said evidence would not only be a mere formality but also abuse of process of law. Learned Sessions Judge ought to have appreciated this position, which is

settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court by various decisions. Learned Sessions Judge ought to have appreciated that the ingredients of the offence under Section 306 are absent. Even, if it is assumed that the material collected by the prosecution is true, it would not be sufficient to establish the case of the prosecution and, therefore, the conducting of the trial against the applicant would be an empty formality. I am, therefore, of the view that the order impugned is liable to be set aside.

31. In this view of the matter, the criminal revision application deserves to be allowed. Hence, I proceed to pass following order:

ORDER

- a] The Criminal Revision Application is **allowed**.
- b] The order dated 20/3/2025 passed below Exhibit-6 by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amravati in Sessions Case No.253 /2023, rejecting the discharge application is quashed and set aside.
- c] The applicant is hereby discharged of offence punishable under Section 306 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code in connection with Crime

No.566/2018 and Charge-sheet No.01/2023 registered by the Badnera Police Station, District Amravati.

The Criminal Revision Application stands disposed of.

[URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.]