

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRI-INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 94 OF 2026
IN
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLN.ST NO. 420 OF 2026**

Satish Madhukar Kamble	Applicant
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra	Respondent

...

Mr. Mohan Malhari Chavan, Advocate for Applicant.
Mr. S. V. Gavand, APP for the Respondent.

...

**CORAM: MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.
DATED: 11th JUNE 2026**

PC.:-

1. The present Interim Application has been filed by the Applicant seeking condonation of delay of 1020 (one thousand and twenty) days in filing the accompanying Criminal Revision Application, challenging the order dated 2nd February 2023 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kolhapur below Exhibit-6 in Sessions Case No. 140 of 2019.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the Applicant submits that the Applicant was not aware of the dismissal of the discharge application, although he had been regularly attending the

proceedings before the Trial Court and his advocate was also appearing in the matter. It is submitted that neither the Applicant nor his advocate was aware of the dismissal of the application and, therefore, the delay of 1020 days has occurred in filing the present Revision Application.

3. It is submitted that the Applicant was deprived of an opportunity to effectively contest the discharge application. Therefore, the Applicant has filed the present application seeking condonation of delay.

4. It is submitted that the delay is neither deliberate nor intentional. According to the Applicant, he was unaware of the impugned order and, upon acquiring knowledge thereof, immediately applied for a certified copy and thereafter filed the present application along with the Revision Application.

5. Learned APP opposes the application, contending that the Applicant has approached this Court only after issuance of a non-bailable warrant and has, thereafter, filed the Revision Application along with the present application seeking condonation of delay.

6. Learned APP submits that the cause shown for condonation of delay is neither sufficient nor satisfactory. It is submitted that there is an inordinate delay of 1020 days and that the matter is pending before the Trial Court at the stage of framing of charge. The discharge application came to be dismissed in default due to the absence of the Applicant and his advocate. It is, therefore, prayed that the application for condonation of delay be rejected.

7. Heard learned counsel for the Applicant and the learned APP for the State.

8. The Applicant seeks condonation of delay of 1020 days in challenging the order whereby his discharge application came to be dismissed in default. The contention of the Applicant that he was regularly attending the Court proceedings and that neither he nor his advocate was aware of the dismissal of the discharge application does not inspire confidence. The delay is substantial and remains inadequately explained. It is also noted that the trial is pending and has not proceeded further in view of the pendency of the present proceedings.

9. In the circumstances, this Court is not satisfied that the Applicant has shown sufficient cause for condonation of the inordinate delay of 1020 days. The reasons assigned are neither satisfactory nor convincing. Hence, the application stands **rejected**.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)