

ORDER BELOW EXH. 1

Today, the Ld. APP and the Advocate Shri. Rohit Rahing for accused no. 2 and 3 present. The accused no. 1 is produced from Yerwada prison on V.C. Ld. Adv. Shri. Rohit Rahing submitted that the vakalatnama for accused no.1 is yet to be received from Yerwada prison. He requested for time for arguments on charge. The accused no. 1 Latif Mohammad Pathan is in custody since 25/08/2019. Since then the matter is pending for charge. In the meantime, accused no. 3 had filed discharge which came to be rejected vide order dated 28/01/2026. Today, the matter was specifically kept for framing charge. Today, Ld. Advocate Shri. Rohit has filed Vakalatnama and adjournment application stating that he wants time to go through the papers.

2] Considering the fact that the accused no. 1 is in custody since more than 6 years, I do not see any valid ground to adjourn the proceedings. Only because a new Advocate has been appointed by the accused, it cannot be a ground to grant adjournment, particularly when the accused were earlier represented by another Advocate and supplied with copies of charge-sheet.

3] Hence, the accused were given full opportunity to make submissions on charges. The Ld. A.P.P. submitted that the role of the applicants is mentioned in the FIR. The statements of eye witnesses also show the presence and role of the accused. Hence, he submitted that charge be framed.


3] Perusal of the charge-sheet shows that the FIR was promptly registered. There are statements of eye-witnesses which

show that the accused were present on the spot at the time of occurrence of crime. Hence, at this stage, there is ample material to frame charge against the accused. Hence, the following order:

**ORDER**

Charge be framed against the accused under sections 302, 452 r/w. 34 of Indian Penal Code.

Date : 31.01.2026



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