

MHSN170009912020



Received on : 14.12.2015
Registered on : 15.12.2015
Decided on : 23.02.2026
Duration : Ys. M. Ds.
10 02 09

IN THE SESSIONS COURT, VITA, AT VITA
(Presided over by R.R. Bhagwat, Addl. Sessions Judge, Vita)

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.52 OF 2024
(Old Criminal Appeal No.248/2015)

Exh.No.18

Subhash Bapu Yevale)
Age: 61, Occupation :) **Appellant**
R/o. Yevalewadi, Tal. Kadegaon,)
Dist. Sangli)

VERSUS

1. Jayshing Khashaba Yevale)
Age: 60 Years, Occu. Agri.)
2. Tanjai Krushna Yevale)
Age: 40 Years, Occu. Agri.)
3. Rangubai Krushna Yevale)
Age: 55 Years, Occu. : Household) **Respondents**
4. Sarita Dhanaji Yevale)
Age: 45 Years, Occu. : Household)
5. Anita Tanaji Yevale)
Age: 35 Years, Occu. : Household)
6. Surekha Vasant Yevale)
Age: 35 Years, Occu. : Household)

- | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 7. | Shalan Jayshing Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 55 Years, Occu. : Household |) | |
| 8. | Shivaji Jayshing Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 37 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 9. | Bapurao @ Ananda Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 29 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 10. | Popat Mahadev Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 65 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 11. | Lilabai Popat Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 60 Years, Occu. : Household |) | |
| 12. | Somnath Popat Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 30 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 13. | Achut Khashaba Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 56 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 14. | Ramesh Gangaram Jagtap |) | <u>Respondents</u> |
| | Age: 45 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 15. | Prakash Gorakh Jagtap |) | |
| | Age: 37 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 16. | Vasant Nana Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 45 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 17. | Rajashri Pandurang Jagtap |) | |
| | Age: 35 Years, Occu. : Household |) | |
| 18. | Sunil Keru Jagtap |) | |
| | Age: 45 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 19. | Appaso Maruti Jagtap |) | |
| | Age: 25 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 20. | Sukhadev Atmaram Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 56 Years, Occu. Agri. |) | |
| 21. | Archana Ananada Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 35 Years, Occu. : Household |) | |
| 22. | Ananada Krushna Yevale |) | |
| | Age: 45 Years, Occu. : Agri. |) | |

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| 23. Nath Khashaba Yevale |) | |
| Age: 59 Years, Occu. : Agri. |) | |
| 24. Ramchandra Gangaram Jagtap |) | |
| Age: 53 Years, Occu. : Agri. |) | |
| 25. Sharda Baburao Jagtap |) | |
| Age: 50 Years, Occu. : Household |) | |
| 26. Baburao Gangaram Jagtap |) | |
| Age: 60 Years, Occu. : Agri. |) | |
| 27. Ranjana Ramesh Jagtap |) | |
| Age: 38 Years, Occu. : Household |) | |
| 28. Sunil Pandurang Yevale |) | <u>Respondents</u> |
| Age: 27 Years, Occu. : Agri. |) | |
| 29. Maruti Gangaram Jagtap |) | |
| Age: 55 Years, Occu. : Agri. |) | |
| 30. Pandharinath Mahadev Yevale |) | |
| Age: 50 Years, Occu. : Agri. |) | |
| 31. Dhanaji Krushna Yevale |) | |
| Age: 56 Years, Occu. : Agri. |) | |
| 32. Ravindra Uttam Jagtap |) | |
| Age: 39 Years, Occu. : Agri. |) | |
| 33. Ranjana @ Rani Ravindra Jagtap-
Yevale, Age: 32 Years, Occu. : Agri. |) | |
| 34. State of Maharashtra |) | |

Appeal Under Section 372 of the Code of Criminal Procedure

Ld. Adv. Shri. C. B. Mali for the appellant.

Ld. Adv. Shri. V. R. Sawant for respondents No.1 to 33.

Ld. APP Shri. M. H. Gramopadhye for respondent No.34.

: JUDGMENT :

(Delivered on 23.02.2026)

1] The appellant/original informant has preferred this appeal against impugned judgment and order dt.02.08.2014

ASJ

passed in Summary Criminal Case No.89/2013 by Ld. Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Kadegaon, Tal. Kadegaon, Dist. Sangli acquitting accused/respondents No.1 to 33 of the offences punishable under sections 143, 147, 323, 504, 427, 149 of the Indian Penal Code.

2] Perused appeal memo, proceeding of Ld. Trial Court and documents relied by both sides. Ld. Counsel for the appellant and Ld. Counsel for respondents No.1 to 33 remained absent when called out. Heard Ld.APP Shri. M.H. Gramopadhye for respondent No.34/State.

3] The appellant is original informant and he has preferred present appeal for setting aside impugned judgment and order dt.02.08.2014 as referred above. It is pertinent to note that present respondent No.34/State had also filed Criminal Appeal No.149/2015 which came to be decided as per judgment Exh.8 dated 31.01.2022 and impugned judgment came to be confirmed. As both appeals had assailed legality of one and the same judgment on the point of setting aside impugned judgment and order of Ld. Trial Court and for convicting the accused, there is no scope to take contrary view after appeal preferred by present respondent No.34/State is decided on merit and the accused are acquitted. In the result, present appeal deserves to be dismissed having become infructuous in view of judgment Exh.8 dated 31.01.2022 pronounced in Criminal Appeal

No.149/2025. In the result, I pass the following order :-

: O R D E R :

1. Criminal Appeal No.52/2024 (Old Criminal Appeal No.248/2015) is dismissed.
2. Proceeding of Criminal Appeal No.52/2024 (Old Criminal Appeal No.248/2015) is closed.

(Dictated and pronounced in open Court)

Vita
dt.23.02.2026

(R.R. Bhagwat)
Additional Sessions Judge, Vita

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that, the contents of this P.D.F. file, are same word to word, as per the original order.

Name of Stenographer	: H.G. Sutar (Steno Grade-I)
Court	: DJ-1 & Addl. Sessions Judge,Vita
Date of order	: 23.02.2026
Signed by Presiding officer on	: 23.02.2026
Uploaded on	: 23.02.2026