

MHOS010023392017 	Received on	:	24.11.2017		
	Registered on	:	24.11.2017		
	Decided on	:	06.06.2026		
	Duration	:	Y	M	D
			08	06	12

PART A**Form No. XXXII****(Title Page of the Judgment)****(Para 44 (i) of Chapter VI of Criminal Manual)****IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL JUDGE OSMANABAD**

(Presided over by Shri. R. K. Khomane)

Special Case (ACB) No. 16/2017**Exh. No.**

(FIR/Crime No.135/2016
at Anand Nagar,Police Station,
Osmanabad, Tq. & Dist. Osmanabad)

Prosecution: The State of Maharashtra
Through Police Station Officer
Aanand Nagar Police Station,
Osmanabad,Tq. & Dist. Osmanabad

Represented by Shri A.A. Doke, Ld APP for the State

Accused Ganesh Kaduba Kharat,
Age 45 Years, Occ. Service
R/o. Plot No.7, Yograj Pushpa
Apartment, Near Jalgaon T point,
Mhasoba Nagar, Harsul,
Aurangabad.

Represented by Shri P.M. Nalegaonkar, Ld.Advocate
for the accused

Date of offence 12.08.2016

Date of F.I.R. 20.09.2016

Date of Charge-sheet 22.11.2017
 Date of framing of Charges 14.11.2018
 Date of commencement of evidence 14.02.2026
 Date on which Judgment is reserved --
 Date of Judgment 06.06.2026
 Date of Sentencing order, if any --

ACCUSED DETAILS

Rank of the accused	Name of the Accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offences charged with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Sec. 428 Cr.P.C.
1.	Ganesh Kaduba Kharat	21.09.2016	22.09.2016	Under sections 7, 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988	Acquitted	--	--

LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT WITNESSES

A. Prosecution :-

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE	Exhibit
PW1	Satish Shivaji Londhe	Complainant	50
PW2	Bramhadeo Vasudeo Gawade	Investigating Officer	57
PW3	Pratap Tukaram Sonawane	Panch No.1	87

B. Defence Witnesses, if any :-

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
---	---	---

C. Court Witnesses, if any :-

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
---	---	---

LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENSE / COURT EXHIBITS

A. Prosecution :-

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Exhibit P-51/PW1	File
2	Exhibit P-52/PW1	Loan file
3	Exhibit P-58 /PW2	Complaint
4	Exhibit P-59/PW2	Letter
5	Exhibit P-60/PW2	Panchanama
6	Exhibit P-61/PW2	Letter
7	Exhibit P-62/PW2	Letter
8	Exhibit P-63/PW2	Stayed Panchanama
9	Exhibit P-64/PW2	Certificate
10	Exhibit P-65/PW2	Certificate of 65-B
11	Exhibit P-66/PW2	Letter
12	Exhibit P-67/PW2	Complaint
13	Exhibit P-68/PW2	Original file
14	Exhibit P-69/PW2	Shimma Kash Register
15	Exhibit P-70/PW2	Recommendation of Loan Proposal
16	Exhibit P-71/PW2	Loan Distribution Register
17	Exhibit P-72/PW2	Copy of pages in Inward and Outward
18	Exhibit P-73/PW2	copy of pages in Muster roll
19	Exhibit P-74/PW2	Panchanama
20	Exhibit P-75/PW2	Statment
21	Exhibit P-76/PW2	Arrest Panchanama
22	Exhibit P-78/PW2	Certificate
23	Exhibit P-79/PW2	Letter
24	Exhibit P-80/PW2	Muddemal submitted letter to P.S.Osmanabad.
25	Exhibit P-81/PW2	Pavati
26	Exhibit P-82/PW2	Documents

27	Exhibit P-83/PW2	Letter
28	Exhibit P-84/PW2	Report of Forensic Lab
29	Exhibit P-85/PW2	Sanction Letter

Documents admitted under section 294 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 :-

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
---	---	---

B. Defence :-

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
---	---	---

C. Court Exhibits :-

Sr.No.	Exhibit Number	Description
---	---	---

D. Material Objects :-

Sr.No.	Material object Number	Description
---	---	---

J U D G M E N T

(Delivered on this 06th day of June, 2026)

The accused has been facing trial for offence punishable under Sections 7 and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”)

2] In brief, the prosecution case is as under;

A] The complainant, Shri Satish Shivaji Londhe, a resident of Osmanabad, was carrying on a stationery business in the weekly market. He intended to start a dairy business by availing a loan under the Seed Capital Scheme. Accordingly, on 27.07.2016, he visited the District Industries Centre, Osmanabad, to make inquiries regarding the said scheme. There, he met the accused, Mr. Kharat. The accused informed him that proposals

under the Seed Capital Scheme were approved by him and that the sanctioned amount was thereafter disbursed through the concerned bank. The accused also provided the complainant with a list of documents required for obtaining a loan under the said scheme. It is further alleged that the accused told the complainant that, for every loan amount of Rs.1,00,000/-, he would have to pay Rs.1,000/- to him. Accordingly, for sanctioning a loan of Rs.3,00,000/-, the accused demanded Rs.3,000/- as illegal gratification and stated that, unless the said amount was paid, the proposal would not be forwarded to the bank. Thereafter, on 10.08.2016, the complainant again visited the District Industries Centre, Osmanabad, and met the accused. On that occasion also, the accused reiterated his demand of Rs.3,000/- in respect of the proposed loan of Rs.3,00,000/-. He further instructed the complainant to contact him after arranging the said amount. On 11.08.2016, after collecting all the necessary documents, the complainant attempted to contact the accused on his mobile phone; however, the voice was not audible. Subsequently, at about 7.00 p.m. to 7.10 p.m., the accused himself called the complainant and asked him to visit his office on the following day with the necessary documents and the amount of Rs.3,000/-. As the complainant was neither willing nor interested in paying the bribe amount, he approached the office of the Anti-Corruption Bureau, Osmanabad, and lodged a written complaint against the accused.

B) On the basis of this complaint Dy. S.P. Shri Gawade sent letter to Executive Engineer Osmanabad for making

arrangement of two person to act as panch witnesses. In pursuance of the said letter two panch witnesses were made available.

C) On 12.08.2016, at about 12:30 p.m., two panch witnesses were present at the Anti-Corruption Bureau, Osmanabad. Dy. S.P. Shri Gawade asked the complainant to orally narrate the contents of the complaint to the panch witnesses. Upon verification that the oral narration was consistent with the written complaint, the panch witnesses affixed their signatures to the written complaint. Thereafter, the date, time, and place for payment of the bribe were fixed. A voice recorder was placed in the complainant's pocket and switched on. Thereafter, the complainant and Panch Witness No. 1 (PW-3) proceeded to the District Industries Office, Osmanabad, at about 11:20 a.m. They returned to the ACB Office at about 12:05 p.m. After confirming that the accused had demanded a bribe, a panchnama was prepared. Thereafter, a trap was arranged after making the necessary preparations in relation to the demand for a bribe. In pursuance thereof, on 18.08.2016 at about 14:25 hours, the complainant and Panch Witness No. 1 went to the District Industries Office, Osmanabad, with the voice recorder placed in the complainant's shirt pocket in switched-on mode. However, accused Kharat became suspicious that action might be taken against him and, therefore, the trap could not be executed and was subsequently suspended. Thereafter, Dy.SP shri. Gawade lodged a complaint against the accused at the Anandnagar Police Station, Osmanabad.

3] On the basis of the report lodged by the complainant, Crime No. 135/2016 came to be registered at Anand Nagar Police Station, Osmanabad, for the aforesaid offences. The investigation was conducted by the Investigating Officer, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Shri Bramhadeo Vasudeo Gawade. During the course of investigation, the Investigating Officer completed all necessary formalities, conducted the pre-trap panchnama and spot panchnama, and collected the relevant evidence pertaining to the demand of bribe. Upon completion of the investigation, the Investigating Officer found sufficient evidence against the accused and, therefore, submitted a charge-sheet before the Special Court, Osmanabad, as the offences were exclusively triable by the said Court.

4] My learned predecessor framed the charge vide Exhibit 21 for the aforesaid offence. The contents of the charge were read over and explained to the accused in his vernacular language. The accused denied the charge, pleaded not guilty, and claimed to be tried.

5] In order to bring home the guilt of the accused, the prosecution examined four witnesses in all. The accused did not adduce any oral or documentary evidence in his defence. His statement under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure was recorded vide Exhibit 89. In his statement, the accused contended that he had not demanded any bribe.

6] In view of the submissions and the case of the prosecution the following points arise for determination and I give my findings thereon with reasons as under :-

<u>Points</u>	<u>Findings</u>
1) Whether the prosecution proves that on : 12.08.2016 in the office of Industry Inspector at D.I.C. Office, Osmanabad accused demanded Rs. 3000/- from complainant Satish Shivaji Londhe for the purpose of accepting loan file and sanction the loan of Rs.3,00,000/(Rs.Three Lacs)for milk business and to forward loan file to Syndicate Bank, branch Osmanabad thereby committed an offence punishable under Section 7 of the Act?	No
2) Whether the prosecution proves that on 12.08.2016 in the office of Industry Inspector at D.I.C. Office, Osmanabad accused demanded Rs. 3000/- from complainant Satish Shivaji Londhe and thereby committed criminal misconduct and thereby committed an offence punishable under section 13(2) of the Act?	No
3) What order ?	: As per final order.

:: REASONS

As to point no.1 and 2.

7] Both the points for determination are interlinked; therefore, they are being discussed together for the sake of convenience and to avoid repetition. It is the case of the prosecution that the accused, being a public servant, demanded a bribe of Rs. 3,000/- from the complainant, Satish Shivaji Londhe,

for accepting the loan file and sanctioning a loan of Rs. 3,00,000/- (Rupees Three Lakhs). In support of its case, the prosecution has adduced both oral and documentary evidence, which requires careful examination.

8] PW-1(Complainant) Satish Shivaji Londhe deposes that in the year 2016 complainant was carrying on a stationery business and had approached Zilla Udyog Kendra, Osmanabad, for obtaining a Seed Capital Scheme. He states that a senior officer directed him to meet subordinate officers and informed him that ₹3,000/- would be required for processing the loan proposal. Thereafter, he met accused Ganesh Kharat, who provided him with a list of required documents. According to the witness, some documents were deficient and his work was not progressing, due to which he became annoyed and approached the ACB office. The witness admits that he filed a complaint before ACB and signed the same. However, he states that he is educated up to 8th standard but cannot read, and that the contents of the complaint were not read over or explained to him before obtaining his signature. He specifically denies that accused Kharat demanded ₹3,000/- as illegal gratification or that he lodged the complaint because of any such demand. According to him, he had been informed by superior officers and other persons in the office that unless ₹3,000/- was paid, the loan proposal would not move further. The witness further denies the prosecution case regarding the demand verification proceedings dated 12.08.2016 and states that he was unaware of the contents

of the panchanama. He also states that the recorded conversation was not played to him. However, he admits that on 18.08.2016 he met the accused and that the conversation was recorded in a voice recorder. He identifies the loan documents submitted by him and also identifies the accused in Court. This witness resiled from the material particulars of his earlier statement; therefore, he was cross-examined by the prosecution. During cross-examination by the prosecution, the witness denied the suggestions that accused Kharat had demanded ₹3,000/- as bribe or had threatened not to forward the loan proposal unless the amount was paid. In cross-examination on behalf of the accused, he specifically admitted that accused Kharat had never demanded any money from him and stated that the contents of the demand verification panchanama were not read over to him.

9] PW-2, the then Dy.S.P, Anti-Corruption Bureau, Osmanabad, deposes that on 12.08.2016 complainant Satish Shivaji Londhe approached the ACB office and lodged a complaint against accused Ganesh Kharat, Industry Inspector, District Industry Centre, Osmanabad, alleging demand of illegal gratification of ₹3,000/- for processing and forwarding his Seed Capital Scheme loan proposal of ₹3,00,000/-. Upon perusal of the complaint and supporting documents, he found a prima facie case of demand of bribe. He further deposes that the complaint was reduced into writing and, after securing panch witnesses, demand verification proceedings were undertaken on 12.08.2016. A voice recorder fitted with a new memory card was supplied to the complainant for recording the conversation with the accused.

After the verification exercise, the complainant and panch witness reported that the accused had accepted the reference to the amount of ₹3,000/- and instructed that the amount should be paid directly and not kept in the file. On playback of the recorded conversation, demand of bribe was confirmed and demand verification panchanama (Exh.60) was prepared. The witness further states that a second demand verification was conducted on 18.08.2016 after compliance of deficiencies pointed out in the complainant's loan proposal. However, during the said interaction, no fresh demand of bribe was made by the accused. Consequently, the proceedings were suspended and a panchanama to that effect was prepared. The electronic record was preserved and hash value reports and certificates under Section 65-B of the Evidence Act were prepared. According to him, after obtaining confidential permission from the competent authority, an FIR was lodged on 20.09.2016. During investigation, original records pertaining to the complainant's loan proposal, office registers, inward and postal registers, muster register and other relevant documents were seized from District Industry Centre under panchanama. The accused was given an opportunity to explain the allegations, was medically examined and arrested on 21.09.2016. His voice sample was also collected in the presence of panch witnesses. The witness further deposes that the recorded conversations and voice samples were forwarded to the Forensic Science Laboratory for examination and the report was received during investigation. On completion of investigation, he found sufficient material indicating demand of illegal gratification by the accused. After obtaining valid sanction for prosecution from the competent

authority, he filed charge-sheet against accused Ganesh Kharat for offences punishable under Sections 7 and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

10] PW-3 Pratap Sonawane, the first panch witness, deposes that on 12.08.2016, while serving as a clerk in the Medium Project Division, Osmanabad, he was deputed to attend the ACB office, Osmanabad. There, the complainant disclosed before him and the other panch witness that accused Ganesh Kharat, Industry Inspector, District Industry Centre, had demanded a bribe of ₹3,000/- for forwarding his loan proposal for sanction. He states that the complaint and supporting documents were shown to the panch witnesses, who verified and signed the same. Thereafter, a blank memory card was inserted into a voice recorder and voice samples of the complainant and panch witnesses were recorded. The complainant was instructed to carry the recorder and the witness accompanied him to Zilla Udyog Kendra.

11] According to this witness, accused Kharat scrutinized the complainant's file and during the conversation, when the complainant stated that his friend was bringing the money, the accused enquired about the amount and was informed that it was ₹3,000/-. The accused then advised the complainant to complete the file formalities and referred him to another officer, namely Mr. Dutte. After returning to the ACB office, the recorded conversation was played, transcribed and a demand verification panchanama (Exh.60) was prepared, which the witness

signed. The witness further deposes that on 18.08.2016 he again accompanied the complainant for a second verification. On that occasion, the accused appeared suspicious of his presence, stated that the work was not within his domain and referred the complainant to Mr. Dubte. No demand of bribe was made during that visit. On return to the ACB office, the recorded conversation was transcribed and a demand verification and suspension panchanama (Exh.63) was prepared. He further states that on 20.09.2016 he remained present during seizure of the complainant's loan file and connected records from DIC under seizure panchanama (Exh.74). On 21.09.2016, he was also present when voice samples of the accused and others were recorded and the relevant panchanama (Exh.77) was prepared. He identified the accused before the Court and stated that he could identify the recorded voices. In cross-examination, the witness admitted that no specific discussion regarding when, where, and how the money was to be paid took place in his presence and that the accused did not expressly demand money from the complainant in his presence. However, he denied the suggestions that the panchanamas, seizure proceedings, and voice sample proceedings were false or that he was deposing at the instance of the Investigating Officer.

12] On the basis of above evidence, the learned APP submits that the prosecution has successfully proved the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt under Sections 7 and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. It is contended that PW-1 has duly proved the background of the transaction and the

initiation of the complaint before the ACB. Though PW-1 was resiled from his previous statement on certain aspects, his evidence cannot be read in isolation and must be considered along with the testimony of PW-2, Investigating Officer and PW-3 panch witness as well as the material documentary and electronic evidence. The APP further submits that PW-3, an independent panch witness, has clearly supported the prosecution version regarding the demand made by the accused during the verification proceedings dated 12.08.2016. It is argued that the conversation recorded in the voice recorder, which was later played and transcribed in the presence of witnesses, clearly indicates acceptance of the demand of ₹3,000/-. The demand verification panchanama (Exh.60) duly corroborates the prosecution case. He further urged that the electronic evidence is duly supported by compliance of Section 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act. According to him, even though no explicit demand was repeated during the second verification dated 18.08.2016, the earlier demand stood established and was only reinforced by the conduct of the accused directing the complainant to complete formalities and route the file through another officer. The APP further argues that the seizure of official records, voice samples, and FSL report further corroborate the prosecution case. It is therefore submitted that the ingredients of Section 7 of the PC Act, namely demand illegal gratification, stand proved and the presumption under Section 20 of the PC Act is attracted, which the accused has failed to rebut. Accordingly, it is prayed that the accused be convicted.

13] On the other hand, the learned defence advocate Mr.Nalegaonkar submits that the prosecution has failed to prove the foundational requirement of demand of illegal gratification, which is sine qua non for conviction under Sections 7 and 13 of the Prevention of Corruption Act. It is argued that PW-1, the complainant, has completely disowned the allegation of demand and has categorically stated in his cross-examination that the accused never demanded any money from him. It is further submitted that PW-1 has admitted that the contents of the complaint and panchanama were not read over or explained to him, thereby rendering his initial version unreliable. It is contended that PW-3, the panch witness, has also not supported the prosecution case in its entirety. In his cross-examination, he has admitted that no specific discussion regarding time, place, or manner of payment of bribe took place in his presence and that the accused did not expressly demand any money from the complainant. Therefore, the essential ingredient of demand is not proved beyond reasonable doubt. The defence further submits that PW-2 is only a investigating officer and his evidence is based on hearsay and procedural acts carried out during investigation. It is argued that mere recording of conversations or preparation of panchanamas cannot substitute the legal requirement of clear and unambiguous demand by the accused. It is further contended that the alleged conversation, even if accepted in its entirety, does not establish any voluntary demand by the accused. At best, it reflects ambiguity and possibility of misunderstanding. It is submitted that in absence of proof of demand, the presumption under Section 20 of the Prevention of Corruption Act does not arise.

14] The defence advocate relies upon settled law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *B. Jayaraj v. State of Andhra Pradesh [(2014) 13 SCC 55]*, *P. Satyanarayana Murthy v. District Inspector of Police [(2015) 10 SCC 152]* wherein it has been held that proof of demand is an indispensable precondition for conviction under the Prevention of Corruption Act.

15] The Ld. defence advocate also places his reliance on following authorities :

Walmik Limbaji Kande Vs. The State of Maharashtra, 2015 ALL MR (Cri) 4190, wherein it is held that, "Investigating Officer can be direct witness of only investigation carried by him and not of alleged incident."

Ram Munjaji Salgar Vs. The State of Maharashtra, 2024 ALL MR (Cri) 3869, wherein it is held that, "*foundational facts, which were within the knowledge of the complainant and shadow panch, can not be said to be established from the sole testimony of the Investigating Officer.*"

16] I have considered the arguments of both the sides, gone through the above rulings as well as evidence on record. The prosecution has charged the accused for the offences punishable under Sections 7 and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. It is well settled that in order to establish an offence under Section 7 of the Act, the prosecution must prove beyond reasonable doubt that the accused made a demand for illegal gratification and that such demand was voluntary and conscious.

Demand of bribe is a sine qua non for constituting the offence. Mere suspicion, recovery of tainted money, or proof of opportunity is not sufficient.

17] In the present case, the complainant (PW-1) has not supported the prosecution on the material aspect of demand. Though he admits having approached the ACB office and having signed the complaint, he has categorically deposed that accused Ganesh Kharat never demanded any amount from him. He has further stated that he became annoyed because his loan proposal was not progressing and that he approached the ACB office on that account. According to him, he was informed by certain officers and other persons that unless ₹3,000/- was paid, the loan proposal would not move forward. Thus, the source of information regarding alleged payment was not the accused himself but third persons.

18] PW-1 has specifically denied the contents of the complaint to the extent they attribute any demand of bribe to the accused. He has stated that the complaint was not read over or explained to him before obtaining his signature. During his cross-examination by the prosecution, nothing substantial could be elicited to support the prosecution case. On the contrary, he maintained that accused Kharat never demanded any money from him. Therefore, the testimony of PW-1 completely demolishes the prosecution case regarding the foundational fact of demand.

19] The Hon'ble Supreme Court in cases of *B. Jayaraj v. State of Andhra Pradesh [(2014) 13 SCC 55]*, *P. Satyanarayana Murthy v. District Inspector of Police [(2015) 10 SCC 152]* and the Constitution Bench judgment in *Neeraj Dutta v. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi) [(2023) 4 SCC 731]*, has consistently held that proof of demand of illegal gratification is an indispensable requirement for establishing offences under Sections 7 and 13 of the Prevention of Corruption Act. Unless demand is proved, conviction cannot be sustained.

20] The prosecution has sought to rely upon the evidence of PW-2, the Investigating Officer, and PW-3, the panch witness. PW-2 has deposed regarding the complaint, demand verification proceedings and investigation carried out by him. However, his evidence is essentially based upon what was reported to him by the complainant and panch witnesses. He was not personally present at the alleged conversation between the complainant and the accused. Therefore, his testimony cannot be treated as direct evidence of demand.

21] PW-3, the panch witness, has stated that during the verification proceedings the complainant informed the accused that his friend was bringing money and, upon enquiry by the accused regarding the amount, informed him that it was ₹3,000/-. However, in his cross-examination, PW-3 admitted that no discussion regarding when, where and how the amount was to be paid took place in his presence. More importantly, he specifically admitted that the accused did not expressly demand

any money from the complainant in his presence. This admission goes to the root of the prosecution case.

22] The evidence of PW-3, at the highest, shows that there was a conversation in which the complainant referred to an amount of ₹3,000/- and the accused enquired about the amount. Such conversation, by itself, cannot be elevated to proof of demand of illegal gratification. Demand cannot be inferred on the basis of assumptions or ambiguous conversation. The prosecution was required to establish a clear and unequivocal demand by the accused, which is absent in the present case.

23] It is significant to note that during the second verification proceeding dated 18.08.2016, no demand of bribe was made by the accused. Both PW-2 and PW-3 have admitted that no fresh demand surfaced during that exercise. Consequently, the proceedings were suspended. This circumstance further weakens the prosecution version.

24] The prosecution has also relied upon recorded conversations and the FSL report. However, even assuming that the recordings and certificates under Section 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act are admissible, the contents thereof must independently establish the demand of illegal gratification. Electronic evidence can corroborate an established fact, but it cannot substitute proof of demand where the complainant himself has denied such demand and the panch witness has admitted that no express demand was made in his presence.

25] The evidence regarding seizure of documents, collection of voice samples, forensic examination, arrest of the accused and filing of charge-sheet merely proves the steps taken during investigation. These circumstances do not by themselves establish the essential ingredient of demand.

26] It is a settled principle of criminal jurisprudence that suspicion, however strong, cannot take the place of proof. In the present case, the prosecution has failed to establish beyond reasonable doubt that the accused demanded ₹3,000/- from the complainant as illegal gratification for processing or forwarding the loan proposal.

27] Once the factum of demand is not proved, the statutory presumption under Section 20 of the Prevention of Corruption Act cannot be invoked. The presumption arises only after the prosecution proves the foundational facts constituting demand and acceptance of illegal gratification. In the absence of proof of demand, no such presumption can be drawn against the accused.

28] Upon an overall appreciation of the evidence of PW-1, PW-2 and PW-3, this Court finds that the prosecution has failed to prove the fundamental ingredient of demand of illegal gratification by the accused. The evidence on record falls short of the standard of proof required in a criminal trial. Consequently, I have replied point no. 1 and 2 in negative.

As to point no.3

29] In view of findings on point no. 1 and 2 the accused found not guilty and is entitled to the acquittal. Muddemal Art. No.1 and 2 seized 4 GB SanDisk Micro SD HC I memory cards being of no value, shall be destroyed, after appeal period is over. Hence, the following order:

-ORDER-

01.	The accused Ganesh Kaduba Kharat is hereby acquitted under section 235(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for the offences punishable under sections 7 and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.
02.	The bail bonds of accused stands cancelled.
03.	The accused is directed to executed PR bond and SB of Rs.50,000/- as provided under section 437-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure.
04.	Muddemal Art. No.1 and 2, seized 4 GB SanDisk Micor SD HC I memory cards being worthless, be destroyed after appeal period.
	Pronounced and dictated in open Court.

Date :- 06.06.2026

[Rajesh K. Khomane]
Special Judge, (Court No.4)
Osmanabad

CERTIFICATE

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

Name of the Stenographer	:	Golhe P.V., Stenographer Gr. I
Name of the Court	:	Special Judge, Osmanabad
Date of Judgment	:	06.06.2026
Judgment signed by the presiding officer	:	06.06.2026
Judgment uploaded on	:	06.06.2026