CHITRA SANJAY SONAWANE
Digitally signed by CHITRA SANJAY SONAWANE
Date: 2026.01.13 15:11:25 +0530



# IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
# CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

## Criminal Revision Application No.71 of 2015

1. Arvind D Desai
Age: Adult, Occ: Business
Having address at :
42, Heena Smriti, NS Road,
JVPD scheme, Vallabha Nagar
Society, Mumbai-400 049.

2. BS Pushkar
Age: Adult, Occ: Architect,
Having his office at :
M/s Pushkar Consultants,
1st floor, Aditya Kutir,
4th Road, Khar West, Mumbai-52 … Applicants.

Vs.

1. The State of Maharashtra
2. Suhas S Kinjavdekar
Age: Adult, Occ: Authorised
representative of Jeewan CHS Ltd
Plot No.7, Janki Kutir, Juhu,
Mumbai-49. … Respondents.

---

Mr Hrishikesh A Joshi i/by Maniar Srivastava Assoc. for the applicant.
Ms Sangeeta D Shinde, APP for the respondent / State.
Ms Saili Dhuru i/by Ms Vrishali R Raje for respondent No.2.

Coram : R.N.Laddha, J.
Date : 13 January 2026.

P.C. :

The present Criminal Revision Application has remained pending adjudication since the year 2015. It appears from the record that Respondent No.2, who is the original complainant, had initially assailed the legality, propriety and correctness of order passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 10th Court, Andheri, Mumbai, whereby accepting the 'C' Summary Report submitted by the Investigating Officer upon completion of the investigation. Aggrieved by the said order, Respondent No.2 preferred Criminal Revision Application No.958 of 2013 before the learned Sessions Court. By a reasoned order dated 5 May 2014, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mumbai, partly allowed the Revision Application and issued directions to the learned Magistrate to call upon the Investigating Officer to carry out further investigation, specifically to collect material evidence regarding the decision taken by the competent authority in compliance with the directions issued in Writ Petition No.453 of 2010, and thereafter to pass appropriate orders in accordance with the law.

2. Today, when the matter is called out for hearing, the learned Counsel appearing in the matter is not in a position to advance arguments. It is pertinent to note that the present Revision Application has been pending for a considerable period since the year 2015, and no interim relief has been granted therein till date.

3. In view of the above, the present revision Application stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

[R. N. Laddha, J.]