

MHPU140033222024

SESSIONS CASE NO. 190/2024



**State of Maharashtra
Vs.
Gautam Shahaji Kakade and others**

ORDER BELOW EXH.10

This regular bail application is moved by accused Sachin Vasant Motkatte and Dada Vitthal Dagade being accused nos. 4 and 6, to release them on regular bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short Cr.P.C.) in Crime No. 283/2024, registered at Wadgaon Nimbalkar Police Station, in offences under Sections 302, 307, 143, 147, 148, 149, 352, 504, 506 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and under Sections 3, 25, 29, 30 of the Arms Act.

2. Heard learned advocate for accused, learned A.P.P. for State, and learned advocate for complainant. Perused the charge-sheet and the documents filed with it.

3. In this offence, complainant-Ankita Ranjeet Nimbalkar, aged 23 years, lodged report against accused persons on 28.06.2024, on which F.I.R. came to be registered, with the allegations that deceased Ranjeet Eknath Nimbalkar was having fond of bullock-cart racing, and was having two bullocks by names '*Sarja*' and '*Sundar*', which were kept in custody of Vitthal Chavan known as Vitthal driver, for maintenance at Budh, Tal. Khatav, Dist. Satara. *Sarja* was purchased one year ago from Gautam Kakade of Nimbut for Rs.61,00,000/-, being accused no. 1 in the offence. Both the bullocks were run in racing, and they have won such races. On 24.06.2024, accused no. 1 Gautam Kakade had been to deceased for purchasing bullock *Sundar*, and stated that he

and Santosh Todkar wanted to purchase *Sundar*. The transaction was settled for Rs. 37,00,000/- and accused no. 1 handed over Rs. 5,00,000/- as earnest contract money. The balance of Rs. 32,00,000/- was agreed to be paid on 27.06.2024 and further, to reduce into writing on stamp the said transaction. The bullock was carried with him by accused no. 1, when the said transaction took place, which was witnessed by complainant. On 27.06.2024, at 11.00 a.m., the deceased and Santosh Todkar had been to the said accused at Nimbut to discuss on the transaction and deceased returned home at 2.00 p.m. Deceased told complainant that without making payment of balance amount, accused no. 1 asked him to put signature on stamp paper, which he refused, and further that the accused no. 1 called in the evening to the deceased. At about 9.00 p.m., on 27.06.2024, the complainant, her deceased husband, child daughter aged 10 months with relative by name Vaibhav Kadam and his friend Pintu Jadhav, proceeded for village Nimbut by a vehicle. Santosh Todkar was waiting at village Lonand, who asked the deceased as to why he did not sign in spite of receiving the whole amount. Her deceased husband told Santosh Todkar that he received only Rs. 5,00,000/-, and the balance amount was not paid by accused no. 1. Santosh Todkar told that accused no. 1 told him that he paid all the amount to deceased Ranjeet and completed the transaction. Santosh Todkar then left for his village. Thereafter, as accused no. 1 had called deceased to receive balance Rs.32,00,000/-, he accompanied with complainant and others to the house of accused no. 1 at 11.00 p.m. They all sat on one cot in the court yard of his house. Accused no. 1 asked her husband as to why he told Santosh that balance amount was not paid. Accused no. 1 told that he would pay the balance

amount in the next morning, and asked the deceased to put signature on the stamp paper. Her deceased husband asked him to pay the balance and then he would immediately sign, and further that if the said accused did not want to complete the transaction, deceased told him to be ready to refund Rs.5,00,000/-, and asked him to return the bullock. Then deceased, complainant and the persons with him went towards their vehicle. At that time, accused no. 1 uttered to deceased that he would see as to how deceased would carry the bullock and accused no. 1 made phone call asking the boys to come. The accused also called his brother Gaurav there. Accordingly, accused Gaurav and three unknown boys came towards the deceased and others. Accused no.1 uttered and told to Gaurav and three boys to assault on the deceased being talking much. Gaurav was possessing a stick, which was taken in his hand by accused no. 1, and he ran to assault the deceased and abused him. Vaibhav Kadam asked Gautam Kakade not to make dispute, and they would discuss on the transaction next day. The other three boys were abusing the deceased and complainant. At that time, accused Gaurav uttered that he would kill the deceased so as not to carry the bullock, and fired once by a pistol in his hand on the head of her deceased husband. The deceased fell down. She, with the help of persons with her, carried the deceased in their vehicle at Sai-Seva Hospital, Waglewadi, and then in ambulance, at Bhoite hospital, Baramati. Thereafter, she approached the police station and lodged report against accused no. 1, his brother Gaurav and three unknown boys. During the course of investigation, the three boys have been identified, including the present accused nos. 4 and 6 amongst total six accused, and have been arraigned in the charge-sheet. In the charge-sheet, it is mentioned that during

course of treatment, deceased Ranjeet died on 29.06.2024, at 2.30 a.m., due to the injury suffered by him and in the *post mortem* report, the cause of death is stated to be head injury. All the accused persons are alleged to have committed the offences as above in prosecution of common object.

4. Learned advocate for accused submitted that the present accused nos. 4 and 6 were not named in F.I.R. which was lodged against accused nos. 1 and 2 and three unknown boys. He submitted that the utterance of assaulting the deceased was made by accused Gautam and firing by pistol was made by accused Gaurav and role of three boys mentioned in F.I.R. is of only uttering abuses. They have not participated in the act. No description either by face or clothes of three unknown boys is given in F.I.R., statements of Vaibhav and Pintu. There is delay of seven hours in lodging F.I.R. and two days in recording statements of the said two witnesses. He submitted relating to accused no. 1 Gautam that the memorandum alleged is doubtful, which is not recorded before panchas. The stick is alleged to be seized which is not mentioned by complainant. The arrest panchnamas of the present accused show that no description of clothes of the accused is mentioned. He further pointed out the discrepancies in holding Test Identification Parade and the Parade held itself. He further pointed out the photographs. The witnesses had opportunity to see the accused persons before the Test Identification Parade, and therefore, it is vitiated. It is carried out after 26 days of incident, which is not proper. There is variation regarding the clothes alleged to have been seized. Affidavit of the complainant does not show the explanation for lodging F.I.R. after 7 hours of incident. There is no recovery from accused nos. 4 and 6. No overtact is

attributed to both the accused to show that they participated in the crime with a common object as that of accused no. 2 to murder the deceased. Therefore, he submitted to release the accused, and also relied on following citations:

(i) *Thulia Kali Vs. State of Tamil Nadu [(1972) 3 Supreme Court Cases 393]* in which, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that:

“12....Delay in lodging the first information report quite often results in embellishment which is a creature of afterthought. On account of delay, the report not only gets bereft of the advantage of spontaneity, danger creeps in of the introduction of coloured version, exaggerated account or concocted story As a result of deliberation and consultation.”

(ii) *Subramanya Vs. State of Karnataka [(2023) 11 Supreme Court Cases 255]* wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that:

“78. If, it is say of the investigating officer that the accused appellant while in custody on his own free will and volition made a statement that he would lead to the place where he had hidden the weapon of offence, the site of burial of the dead body, clothes etc., then the first thing that the investigating officer should have done was to call for two independent witnesses at the police station itself. Once the two independent witnesses would arrive at the police station thereafter in their presence the accused should be asked to make an appropriate statement as he may desire in regard to pointing out the place where he is said to have hidden the weapon of offence etc. When the accused while in custody

makes such statement before the two independent witnesses (panch-witnesses) the exact statement or rather the exact words uttered by the accused should be incorporated in the first part of the panchnama that the investigating officer may draw in accordance with law. This first part of the panchnama for the purpose of Section 27 of the Evidence Act is always drawn at the police station in the presence of the independent witnesses so as to lend credence that a particular statement was made by the accused expressing his willingness on his own free will and volition to point out the place where the weapon of offence or any other article used in the commission of the offence had been hidden. Once the first part of the panchnama is completed thereafter the police party along with the accused and the two independent witnesses (panch-witnesses) would proceed to the particular place as may be led by the accused. If from that particular place anything like the weapon of offence or blood stained clothes or any other article is discovered then that part of the entire process would form the second part of the panchnama. This is how the law expects the investigating officer to draw the discovery panchnama as contemplated under Section 27 of the Evidence Act. If we read the entire oral evidence of the investigating officer then it is clear that the same is deficient in all the aforesaid relevant aspects of the matter.”

(iii) *Rajesh and Another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh [2023 SCC OnLine SC 1202]* in which, the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that:

33. “.....Significantly, though the Crime Details Form notes

that two panch witnesses were present, there is no narrative by them and they simply signed the form. The same is the position with the Crime Details Form (Ex. P14), relating to the finding of blood on the walls of the washing area and the floor; black plastic slippers; and an empty bottle of liquor. The same panch witnesses find mention in this Crime Detail Form and they affixed their signatures but again, it is not their narrative and there is no recording of how they went about finding these objects. Further, the form straightaway records the opinion that Rajesh Yadav and Raja Yadav had murdered Ajit Pal, put his body in a plastic sack and threw it into the well.”

“34. Property Seizure Memos (Ex. P18 and Ex. P23), relating to the seizure of the blood-stained clothes of Rajesh Yadav and Raja Yadav respectively, are drafted likewise wherein the witnesses, Bambam (PW-9) and Surjeet Singh, are named but there is no narrative on their part as to how they were led and assisted by someone to find these objects. On the same lines, Property Seizure Memo (Ex. P9), relating to the seizure of the blood-stained soil, controlled soil and the plastic slippers; Property Seizure Memo (Ex. P10), relating to seizure of the liquor bottle; Property Seizure Memo (Ex. P12), relating to seizure of the body of the deceased and his clothes along with the hair found in his right fist; Property Seizure Memo (Ex. P11), relating to seizure of the murder weapon; and Property Seizure Memo (Ex. P19) relating to seizure of the two mobile phones; also reflect the same style of recording. Witnesses to the panchnamas and the seizures acted as mere attestors to the

documents and did not disclose in their own words as to how these objects were discovered, i.e., at whose instance and how. Ergo, no lawful validity attaches to these proceedings recorded by the police in the context of collection of all this evidence.”

(iv) ***Manoj Madanlal Tekam Vs. State of Maharashtra [2014 SCC OnLine Bom 1236]*** wherein, the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that:

“39. The admissible part of memorandum recorded under section 27 of the Evidence Act is reproduced hereunder:

‘I have concealed the said sword-cane.’”

“40. From the aforesaid, it is crystal clear that the appellant has not stated the place where the sword-cane (gupti) was concealed by him. Though, Ananta (PW5) claims from his evidence that such a statement was made in respect of the place in contemporaneous document namely; memorandum statement, it is absent. If the place was not stated by the appellant, the consequent recovery from the place from where the recover is made, according to us, is of no use”

(v) ***Pavan s/o. Nandkishor Sedani Vs. State [2021 DGLS (Bom) 2915]*** in which, the Hon’ble Bombay High Court observed that:

“The prosecution is however heavily relying on two circumstances to contend that prima facie, the chain of circumstances is complete. The first circumstance is that pursuant to memorandum recorded under section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, which contains a disclosure that the applicant has hidden the spare magazine of the weapon used and that such place will be shown to the police, an empty

magazine can fit in the butt stock of the weapon forwarded by the Investigating Agency. Surprisingly, the Investigating Agency does not appear to have sought a specific opinion from the ballistic expert as to whether the empty magazine was unique or typical to the weapon seized or could have been used in any weapon of similar make or structure. In the absence of material to suggest that the empty magazine could have been used, or was intended to be used only in the weapon of offence which is allegedly recovered on the basis of the memorandum of the co-accused, at least, at this stage, I am not inclined to hold the same against the applicant-accused.”

(vi) ***Mukesh Tiwari Vs. State of U.P. [2021 SCC OnLine ALL 193]*** wherein, the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that:

“On the basis of the facts and circumstances discussed above, an inference can easily be drawn that this is a case of blind murder, no one actually witnessed the incident and the FIR was lodged on the basis of guess-work and suspicion and the appellants have been implicated on account of suspicion because of the previous enmity. Even the possibility of the FIR being ante-timed cannot be ruled out as at the time of conducting inquest the G.D. Entry of the Chick FIR was not available and the dispatch time of the Special Report has not been proved by the prosecution.”

(vii) ***Ram Govind Upadhyay Vs. Sudarshan Singh and others [(2002) Supreme Court Cases 598]*** wherein, the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that:

“4. Apart from the above, certain other which may be attributed to be relevant considerations may also be noticed at this juncture though however, the same are only illustrative and nor exhaustive neither there can be any. The considerations being:

(a) While granting bail the Court has to keep in mind not only the nature of the accusations, but the severity of the punishment, if the accusation entails a conviction and the nature of evidence in support of the accusations.

(b) Reasonable apprehensions of the witnesses being tampered with or the apprehension of there being a threat for the complainant should also weigh with the Court in the matter of grant of bail.

(c) While it is not accepted to have the entire evidence establishing the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt but there ought always to be a prima facie satisfaction of the Court in support of the charge.

(d) Frivolity in prosecution should always be considered and it is only the element of genuineness that shall have to be considered in the matter of grant of bail and in the event of there being some doubt as to the genuineness of the prosecution, in the normal course of events, the accused is entitled to an order of bail.”

(viii) *Shajaji Mugutrao Kakde Vs. The State of Maharashtra [Cri.Bail Application No. 3148 of 2024, decided on 27.08.2024]* wherein, the Hon'ble Bombay High Court observed as under:

“5. In the above-referred backdrop, it is important to note

that the informant is the eye-witness, who is the widow of the deceased and narrated the incident. However, in the FIR, there is not mention about the presence of the applicant or any role played by the applicant directly or indirectly”.

“6. Thus, after the FIR and the remand sought by the police, recording of the supplementary statement and thereby improving the story and coming up with new story to involve the applicant in the alleged offence, creates doubt about prosecution story against the applicant.”

(ix) *Shivraj Gorakh Satpute Vs. State of Maharashtra [2023 SCC OnLine Bom 1996]* in which, the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that:

“9....The concerned officer has not recorded the NDPS Act. Hence, prima facie the search and seizure, which is in contravention of the mandatory provisions of Section 42 of the NDPS Act prima facie makes the recovery doubtful.”

5. Learned A.P.P. for State submitted that the present accused nos. 4 and 6 were called on the spot where deceased was killed by accused no. 1, who is named in FIR, and the present accused accompanied the spot with accused no.2, who is also named in the FIR and then accused no. 2 fired pistol at deceased resulting into his death. He submitted that the common object of all the accused *prima facie* reveals to be that of killing the deceased. In order to hide the evidence of crime, father of accused nos. 1 and 2, being accused no.3, had hidden the C.C.T.V. footage in DVR on spot. In the Test Identification Parade, the present accused persons have been identified by complainant and eye witnesses. Role of accused with material is mentioned in the charge-sheet. He submitted that in view of serious nature of

offence, the application may be rejected.

6. Learned advocate for complainant adopted the arguments made by learned A.P.P. and in further submissions, he argued that the present accused persons who are identified in T.I.P. were present on the call of accused no.1 on spot and played active role with the common object of eliminating the deceased so that he may not carry or demand back the bullock from accused no.1. They approached with accused no. 2 on spot in a minute, who was having pistol and stick. Statements of Vaibhav and Pintu being eye witnesses, show the description of the present accused persons. In spite of requests of said witnesses, deceased was killed. The deceased was young and married with complainant, having a daughter of 10 months. He submitted that matters of evidence and trial cannot be gone into at the time of deciding bail application. Only *prima facie* material as per the prosecution case in the charge-sheet has to be perused by the Court. Therefore, he submitted to reject the application and relied on following citation:

Rohit Bishnoi Vs. The State of Rajasthan and another [2023 Live Law (SC) 560: 2023 INSC 642] wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under:

“18. This Court has, on several occasions discussed the factors to be considered by a Court while deciding a bail application. The primary considerations which must be placed at balance while deciding the grant of bail are:

(i) The seriousness of the offence;

(ii) The likelihood of the accused fleeing from justice;

(iii) The impact of release of the accused on the prosecution witnesses;

(iv) Likelihood of the accused tampering with evidence. While

such a list is not exhaustive, it may be stated that if a Court takes into account such factors in deciding a bail application, it could be concluded that the decision has resulted from a judicious exercise of its discretion, vide Gudikanti Narasimhulu vs. Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh- [(1978) 1 SCC 240] ; Prahlad Singh Bhati vs. NCT, Delhi- [(2001) 4 SCC 280] ; Anil Kumar Yadav vs. State (NCT of Delhi) - [(2018) 12 SCC 129]”

7. The prosecution case brought against the present accused nos. 4 and 6 for offence punishable under Section 302 of I.P.C. being the major offence and Section 149 of I.P.C., from the *prima facie* material produced with the charge-sheet is as under:

(i) The transaction in respect of bullock was entered into between accused no. 1 and deceased Ranjeet Nimbalkar on 24.06.2024, and both were knowing well each other, however, there was dispute between them with respect to payment of money, for which deceased had been to accused no. 1. Witness Santosh Todkar was also involved in the transaction. Deceased was again called in the evening, and pursuantly, he proceeded to visit accused with his wife, witnesses Vaibhav and Pintu.

(ii) They met with Santosh Todkar in the way, who left from there, and then deceased and others proceeded to the spot where there was altercation between accused no. 1 and deceased. Accused no. 1 called accused nos. 2, 4 to 6 on the spot on phone, who approached there, to whom accused no. 1 told to assault the deceased. The stick in the hands of accused no. 2 Gaurav was taken by accused no. 1 and he went to assault deceased with abuses. Accused nos. 2, 4 to 6 were abusing the deceased and witnesses present with him. Accused no. 2 uttered that he would kill the

deceased and took out the pistol and fired in the head of deceased, who died during the course of treatment.

(iii) FIR came to be registered on report wife of deceased, and it is stated therein that the deceased was taken by informant-wife first at one hospital and then to another.

8. For accused, the case of *Thulia Kali* (supra) is relied on, which is a matter of appeal wherein trial took place and the above observations are made. At this stage of the matter, from the *prima facie* material on record, the complainant-wife stated that after her husband was injured by bullet, she with the help of witnesses Vaibhav and Pintu, took him to hospitals and then came to lodge report, and therefore, the said delay in such a serious nature of offence cannot be fatal, looking to the stage of matter where the accused has sought bail.

9. With regard to knowledge or intention to kill, the evidence by way of statements of complainant, Vaibhav and Pintu are *prima facie* material, which show that the transaction of the deceased was with accused no.1. There was meeting between accused no. 1 and deceased on 27.06.2024, which fact is also stated by witness Santosh Todkar in his statement dated 29.06.2024. Accused no. 1 is alleged to have called the deceased, who accompanied with his wife and two witnesses to the spot of house of accused no.1. There was altercation between accused no. 1 and deceased. The present accused nos. 4 and 6 with accused nos. 2 and 5 then approached the spot on call made by accused no. 1. Accused no. 1 took the stick in the hands of accused Gaurav to assault deceased, who was prevented by witness Vaibhav. Accused nos. 4 to 6 were abusing deceased. In the meantime, accused no. 2 uttering to kill the deceased, took out pistol and fired a bullet in the

head of deceased whereby he fell down. Thus, on the call of accused no. 1, accused nos. 2, 4 to 6 approached the spot with a gun and stick, and accused no. 1 used the said stick to assault deceased and prevented by witness Vaibhav. Accused nos. 2, 4 to 6 were called by accused no. 1, who approached immediately on the spot and incident took place. They were asked by accused no. 1 to assault the deceased, in the circumstances when accused no. 2 was possessing pistol as well as stick. Accused no. 2 fired at deceased. The common object alleged against the present accused is brought by prosecution with the charge-sheet. The present accused persons, when the offence was being committed, took part therein, who approached on the spot with accused no. 2 having pistol with him. The case of *Mukesh Tiwari (supra)* is relied on for accused wherein the matter was in appeal after trial where there were no witnesses to the incident and F.I.R. was lodged on guess work. In the present case, there are three eye witnesses of the incident including wife of deceased who lodged report. The Test Identification Parade of the present accused is challenged and it is further argued that they were not described in F.I.R., and the subsequent statements of the complainant and two witnesses are manipulated, and that till holding the Test Identification Parade very late, there was opportunity to the said witnesses to see accused persons. The case of *Shahaji Kakade (supra)* is relied on, in which, there was no mention of the said accused and role. In the present case, role of accused nos. 4 and 6 though not named in F.I.R., is stated to be the persons who approached the spot with pistol possessed by accused no. 2 and stick, and while the offence was committed, they were present on the spot and taking part therein. The common object is brought with *prima facie* material on record against the accused.

The Test Identification Parade was held after seeking order of Magistrate. The submission that the identity of the present accused persons is not established in the material produced with charge-sheet, cannot be accepted inasmuch as their identities are established during the course of investigation of the offence and lastly, Test Identification Parade is held being a *prima facie* material at this stage of the matter. Apart therefrom, the DVR of CCTV footage is also seized by the police from the spot and it is sent for chemical analysis, which was alleged to have been removed by accused no. 3.

10. The cases of *Subramanya, Rajesh and Manoj Tekam (supra)* are relied on for accused which are appeals which arose from the trials held and the above observations relating to Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act are made. The case of *Pavan Sedani (supra)* is relied on, in which above observations on matters under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act are made. Further case of *Shivraj Satpute (supra)* is relied on for accused, in the matter under NDPS Act where mandatory provisions of Section 42 were not followed and recovery was held doubtful. At this stage of the matter of deciding bail application, it appears that the pistol by which accused no. 2 fired a bullet in the head of deceased, is recovered from accused no. 1 and the said panchanama under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act is also challenged by present accused nos. 4 and 6. The pistol is seized by police and apart therefrom, there is evidence of three eye witnesses in the matter *prima facie* showing that pistol was fired at deceased at head, in which, he received bullet injury. The seized muddemal is deposited with Forensic Laboratory for the purpose of chemical analysis and report of the Analyzer.

11. In *Ram Govind Upadhyay (supra)*, it is held by Hon'ble Supreme Court *inter alia* that frivolity of prosecution is always to be considered, and it is only the element of genuineness that shall have to be considered in the matter of grant of bail. Applying the said principle to the instant case, the statements of eye witnesses and evidence collected by Investigating Officer, does not show frivolity of prosecution case.

12. After receiving injury, deceased was initially admitted to Sai-Seva hospital at Waglewadi and then Bhoite hospital, Baramati, and further at Ruby Hall Clinic, Pune, who died on 29.06.2024, in the morning. The inquest was carried out and then the *post mortem*, in which, it is stated that death of deceased resulted due to firearm injury to head associated with head injury. Learned advocate for accused submitted that there were 9 other abrasion injuries on the dead body of deceased. Learned A.P.P. submitted that after receiving bullet injury, deceased was rushed to the hospital by his wife and witnesses Vaibhav and Pintu, and from that hospital, to another hospital. At this stage of the matter, evidence of eye witnesses coupled with the recovery of the weapon shows that the observations in the *post mortem* report are made relating to cause of death, as well as the position of dead body. Alongwith pistol, empty round cartridge, one iron magazine and *bamboo* stick have been seized in the offence. The bullet was taken out from the brain of deceased, and all the muddemal is sent for chemical analysis.

13. Accused no. 3 Shahaji Mugutrao Kakade being father of accused nos. 1 and 2 was also apprehended, whose bail application was rejected, and thereafter, he approached Hon'ble Bombay High Court by filing Cri. Bail Application No. 3148/2024,

in which, it is held that at the most Section 201 of I.P.C. would apply in respect of the said accused, aged 70 years, and he came to be released on bail.

14. Learned advocate for complainant relied on the case of *Rohit Bishnoi (supra)* in which, factors to be considered are laid down including seriousness of offence and tampering evidence or witnesses. Therefore, looking to the nature of offence, evidence collected against accused that they approached the spot with accused no. 2 with gun and stick in his hand, and gave threats and abuses to deceased and material filed with the charge-sheet, their role in the offence committed in prosecution of common object, likelihood of tampering of evidence and witnesses, no case is made out by the accused to release them on regular bail. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

Application is hereby rejected.

Date :- 22.11.2024.

(V. C. Barde)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Baramati.

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that the contents of this P.D.F. file Order are same word for word as per original Order.

Name of Stenographer : V.B.Lalsangi
Stenographer (G-1)

Court Name : V. C. Barde
Additional Sessions Judge,
Baramati, Dist. Pune.

Date of Order : 22.11.2024.
Order signed by
Presiding Officer : 22.11.2024.
Order uploaded on : 22.11.2024.