



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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 4 OF 2024

[Rohit Mangu Korsu **vs.** State of Maharashtra, through
PSO, Aheri, Dist. Gadchiroli and anr.]

with

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 884 OF 2023

[Biplav Gitish Sikdar **vs.** State of Maharashtra, through
PSO, Aheri, Dist. Gadchiroli and anr.]

Office Notes, Office Memoranda
of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. Tarun C. Parmar, Advocate for the petitioners
Mr. N. R. Rode, A.P.P. for the State/respondent no. 1

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

DATE : 27-11-2025.

Heard.

2. The petitioners have approached this Court
for quashing First Information Report (FIR).

3. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor (APP)
submits that 'A' summary has been filed. It appears that
FIR was lodged under the provisions of the Unlawful
Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits
that sanction to prosecute petitioners has been rejected
and, therefore, FIR will have to be quashed.

2

5. Learned APP has shown us across the bar order dated 25-11-2025 passed below Exhibit 1 by the Sessions Court, Aheri in Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 41/2024. The Sessions Court has taken cognizance of 'A' summary. It has issued notice to informant. In response, informant i.e. Assistant Police Inspector appeared before the Court and gave no objection to the proceedings. The trial Court then took note of the fact that an amount of Rs. 27,68,000/- was seized in connection with the offence and it was deposited with Police Station, Aheri. The Sessions Court was of the view that while deciding 'A' summary report, it will have to pass order regarding the seized amount. Accordingly, the Court issued notice to the petitioners to show cause why order should not be passed in respect of seized amount and whether they accept the amount was seized from them and whether they claim the said amount to be owned by them and are entitled to get back the amount.

6. Learned APP, on instructions from the Investigating Officer Mr. Ajay Kokate, who is present in Court, submits that sanction has been refused for lack of evidence. He submits that since huge amount was recovered from the petitioners, 'A' summary has been filed. Thus, the investigating agency is hopeful of collecting evidence to approach sanctioning authority afresh.

3

7. That being so, the argument that since sanction is refused, the FIR will have to be quashed is without substance. The petitions are accordingly dismissed.

(JUDGE)

(JUDGE.)

wasnik