



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1982 OF 2024**

M.S.R.T.C., Aurangabad  
Through Authorized Person  
Satish Yadavrao Dabhade  
Age : 55 years, Occu : Account Officer,  
R/o. D.C. Office, M.S.R.T.C.,  
Samarth Nagar, Aurangabad.

... Applicant  
[Orig. Complainant]

Versus

1. Rajesh Kashinath Sonwane,  
Age : 32 years, Occu : Employee,  
R/o, House No. 156, Eknath Nagar,  
Pribazar, Aurangabad.

2. The State of Maharashtra ... Respondents

.....

Mr. B. S. Deshmukh, Advocate for the Applicant.  
Mr. Sk. Mohd. Rasiq h/f Mr. Sk. Kayyum Najir, Advocate for  
Respondent No.1.  
Mr. S. M. Ganachari, APP for Respondent No.2-State.

.....

**CORAM : ABHAY S. WAGHWASE, J.**

Reserved on : 14.01.2026

Pronounced on : 20.01.2026

**ORDER :**

1. Present application is for condonation of delay of 208 days caused in filing revision against the judgment and order of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Aurangabad dated 18.07.2022 in Criminal Appeal No. 45 of 2021, acquitting present respondent no.1 from charges under Sections 406, 409, 417 and 420 of IPC.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant pointed out that, by virtue of crime registered at Bidkin Police Station, present respondent no.1 was tried by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Aurangabad for above offences, however, by order dated 23.11.2020, he came to be acquitted against which, criminal appeal was preferred, but the same was also dismissed by order dated 18.07.2022. It is further submitted that, applicant intends to question the same by way of revision before this Court. However, there has been delay.

3. Learned counsel pointed out that, delay is unintentional. According to him, applicant got knowledge of the impugned judgment at a belated stage. That, much time was spent in the process of obtaining copies from the Corporation as well as opinion of legal advisor for filing revision. That, even time was spent for obtaining necessary administrative approval. According to him, all these factors contributed to the delay, which being unintentional, in the interest of justice, it is urged to condone the same.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent has strongly opposed on the ground that there is huge delay. That, there is no plausible or proper explanation and therefore, delay not being explained sufficiently, he prays to dismiss the application.

5. Heard. Perused the papers. Admittedly, present respondent no.1 was tried for commission of offence under Sections 406, 409, 417 and 420 of IPC. Papers show that, learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, after conducting trial, acquitted respondent no.1 by order dated 23.11.2020, against which, appeal seems to have been preferred bearing Criminal Appeal No. 45 of 2021 and the order of the Sessions Court rejecting the said appeal is dated 18.07.2022.

6. Thereafter, if at all revision was to be preferred, timely steps were expected to be taken. However, same has not happened. Reasons for delay are spelt out in para 3 of the application. Primarily, delay is attributed to seeking advice from legal advisor and administrative delay. However, in para 3 itself, it has been stated that they got knowledge about the impugned order from law officer at a belated stage. When proceedings are instituted, party is expected to be diligent. However, same does not seem to have happened. Here, delay is of 208 days. Reasons put forth for delay are not convincing and satisfactory. Therefore, as no case for condonation of delay is made out, **the application is rejected.**

**[ABHAY S. WAGHWASE, J.]**