

ORDER BELOW EXH.37

(Passed on this 31st January, 2026)


The Ld. Advocate for the accused no. 2 and 3 has sought adjournment on the ground that he has been recently engaged and he is yet to receive papers from the previous advocate. I have perused the application. The Ld. Advocate has claimed that he has not received documents from the previous advocate and also from the prosecution. Further, the Ld. Advocate has stated that he also wants to file writ petition challenging the rejection of discharge application of accused no. 3. Hence, he has prayed for adjournment.

2] The accused no. 1 is in custody from 25/08/2019. The record shows that the copies of the charge-sheet were provided to the accused on 10/11/2019 and received by their advocate. Change of advocate cannot be a ground for adjournment. The accused no. 1 is languishing in custody since last 6 years whereas accused no. 2 and 3 are out on bail. Today, the charges were framed against the accused and the matter now is adjourned for compliance by the prosecution. The Ld. Advocate for the accused has not pointed out which documents he has not received from the prosecution. Hence, the application is vague and devoid of merits and deserves to be rejected. Hence, the following order-

ORDER

Application below Exh.37 is rejected.

Junnar, Pune
Dt. : 31/01/2026


(S. B. Shelar)
Additional Sessions Judge, Junnar
Tal. Junnar, Dist. Pune.