



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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.941 OF 2025

Shri Pankaj S/o Moreshwar Dikonwar alias Pankaj Tanaji Kusalkar
vs.

Addl. Director General and Inspector General of Prison, Maharashtra State, Pune and ors.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri Raju Kadu, Advocate for petitioner.
Shri S. A. Ashirgade, Addl. Public Prosecutor for respondent Nos.1 to 3.

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE AND RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.

DATED : 8th December, 2025

On 19/11/2025 following order was passed :

“ Counsel for the petitioner submits that Registry has processed this petition, which otherwise ought not to have been. He submits that petitioner had earlier filed petition through e-filing as also physical filing. Petition that was filed physically was numbered as Criminal Writ Petition No.713/2024 which has been decided by this Court vide judgment dated 11.08.2025. He submits that Registry has now processed the petition that was e-filed and numbered it as Criminal Writ Petition No.941/2025. Thus, it appears that one petition has been processed twice by the Registry.

2. *Registrar (Judicial) shall inquire into the matter and file report.*

3. *List in the week commencing 8.12.2025.”*

2. In response, Registrar (Judicial) has filed report stating therein that on 03/08/2024 Advocate Raju Kadu had filed Criminal Writ Petition through e-filing. The petition was checked by the registry on 05/08/2024 and was allotted Stamp Number 6403/2024. The petition was under objection and therefore was continued on stamp number from the year 2024. Shri Raju Kadu, counsel for the petitioner had then filed another Criminal Writ Petition by physical mode on 05/08/2024. The registry was unaware of e-filing and in view of notice issued by the Registrar (Judicial-I), the registry

accepted physical filing and after checking, proceeded and registered as Criminal Writ Petition No.713/2024 which was disposed of by the Court on 11/08/2025.

3. According to registry, counsel for petitioner neither turned up to remove office objection nor intimated the registry by way of pursis to withdraw/not pressed e-filed matter which was on stamp for disposal in computer system. Also, he had not informed regarding physical filing and disposal of the same. Rather, he made a statement in paragraph No.14 of memo of petition that he has not approached before this Court or the Honourable Supreme Court of India at any time in the instant subject matter.

4. At this stage, counsel Shri Raju Kadu has tendered apology with a request that same should be accepted on behalf of registry as well. He submits that henceforth he will be careful in this regard.

Apology is accordingly accepted.

Registrar (Judicial) and concerned shall be informed of this development.

5. At the request of learned counsel for the petitioner, present petition is disposed of as withdrawn.

(Raj D. Wakode, J.)

(Anil L. Pansare, J.)