

TIKAM

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

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 78 OF 2026

VAISHALI
ANIL
TIKAM

Digitally signed
by VAISHALI
ANIL TIKAM
Date:
2026.04.07
14:08:31 +0530

**Tikamsingh Bhagwansingh Panwar
Vs.**

...Applicant

The State of Maharashtra

...Respondent

Mr. Alekh Wagh a/w. Tejas Dhotre (thr. VC), Advocate for Applicant.
Mr.S.R. Agarkar, APP for Respondent-State.
HC 3255 Salvi, Bandra Railway present.

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.

DATE : 30th MARCH, 2026.

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the Applicant and learned APP for the State.
2. The challenge in this Criminal Revision Application is the impugned order passed below Exhibit 37 by Learned Additional Sessions Judge, City Civil and Sessions Court, Greater Mumbai by order dated 03/02/2025.
3. It is contention of learned counsel for Applicant that under Section 294 of Criminal Procedure Code (Cr.P.C.), Applicant had admitted documents produced by the prosecution and in the said documents, applicant admitted the arrest panchnama and it was exhibited as Exhibit '35'. Later on, Applicant came to know that in the said panchnama it is

TIKAM

mentioned that Applicant was arrested with blood stains clothes (shirt and pant). Immediately Applicant filed application before the Learned Sessions Judge stating that Applicant is not admitting the said panchnama and the said document be de-exhibited. But, learned Trial Court has rejected the application. Learned counsel further submitted that as Applicant is not admitting the panchnama and the said application was given on the same day, the trial Court should have considered this fact and requested to allow the application.

4. It is contention of learned APP that the Applicant initially admitted the arrest panchnama. Applicant is not disputing his arrest. Once document is exhibited, it cannot be de-exhibited. The matter is at fag end. Evidence is completed and matter is posted for arguments and requested to reject the application.

5. I have heard both learned counsel. Perused the documents produced on record and the impugned order. It appears that while rejecting the application of the Applicant, the learned Sessions Judge has observed that applicant admitted the panchnama, hence, it was exhibited. Once the document admitted, it cannot be de-exhibited and there is no provision for it. In my view, on the same day, Applicant had filed application for de-exhibiting the document. Applicant is not disputing about his arrest, but he disputing about the reference made in arrest

TIKAM

panchnama about seizure of blood stained clothes (shirt and pant) put by the applicant at the time of arrest. Now the matter is at fag end. If applicant is permitted to put his contentions in respect of seizure of blood stained shirt and pant at the time of final hearing it suffice. Accordingly, I pass following order:

ORDER

- (i) Criminal Revision Application is partly allowed.
- (ii) The Applicant is permitted to put his contentions about seizure of blood stained shirt and pant which is mentioned in his arrest panchanama at the time of final arguments before the trial Court. The trial Court deal with the said issue on its own merits.
- (iii) Criminal Revision Application is disposed of.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)