

Exhibit No.71/B

Reg.Criminal Case No.13/2023

State Vs. Pravin Salunkhe

 MHRG160001792023	Received on	:	11.08.2023.
	Registered on	:	11.08.2023.
	Decided on	:	03.07.2026.
	Duration:	:	Ys. Ms. Ds.
			02 10 22

IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FIRST CLASS, PALI,
DISTRICT RAIGAD

(Presided over by Shri.R.A.Shivratri)

Regular Criminal Case No.13/2023.

Exh.No.71/B.

(FIR No.99/2023 of Pali Police Station,
Taluka Sudhagad, District Raigad.)

Prosecution	::	The State of Maharashtra.
Represented by	::	Smt.V. V. Mhatre , learned A.P.P. for the State.
Accused	::	Pravin Baban Salunkhe , Age-43 years, Occupation -Agri., R/o- Vasunde, Tal-Sudhagad, Dist-Raigad.
Represented by	::	Shri.N.M.Shewale , learned Advocate for the accused.

Date of Offence	29.06.2023
Date of FIR	29.06.2023
Date of Chargesheet	11.08.2023
Date of Framing of Charges	10.11.2023
Date of commencement of evidence	06.12.2023
Date on which Judgment is reserved	-----
Date of the Judgment	03.07.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	-----

Accused details

Name of Accused	Date of arrest (Formal)	Date of Release on Bail	Offences Charged with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Section 428, Cr. P.C.
Pravin Baban Salunkhe	04.07 2023	14.08. 2023	U/Secs. 304-A,279,337,338, 420,465,468 of the IPC and u/s.3(1)181,146/196,184 and 192 of Motor Vehicle Act	Aquitted U/Secs. 304-A,279,337, 338,420,465, 468 of the IPC and 184 of Motor Vehicle Act and Convicted u/s.3(1)/181, 146/196, and 192 of Motor Vehicle Act	41 days

A. List of Prosecution witnesses:-

Rank	Name	Exh. Nos.	Nature of Evidence
PW-01	Pradip Eknath Patil	18	Informant
PW-02	Kiran Ganpat Sajekar	20	Panch
PW-03	Rahul Pithu Kamble	23	Panch
PW-04	Nilesh Dhondiram Mahadik	26	Witness
PW-05	Bhagwan Ramchandra Kalbhor	29	Panch
PW-06	Ramesh Dinkar Gaikwad	32	Witness
PW-07	Samadhan Dattu Patil	35	Witness

PW-08	Vishnu Gangaram Savant	36	Witness
PW-09	Sharad Pandurang Patil	38	Witness
PW-10	Prashant Suresh Patil	39	Witness
PW-11	Dilip Ganjidhar Patil	40	Witness
PW-12	Adnan Irashad Sayyad	42	Witness
PW-13	Akhil Ismail Fankar	43	Witness
PW-14	Ravindra Sitaram Sajekar	44	Witness
PW-15	Mahesh Dadarao Devkate	51	Witness
PW-16	Sarita Dattaram Chavan	56	Investigating Officer

B. Defence witnesses, if any :-

Rank	Name	Nature of Evidence
NIL		

C. Court witnesses, if any :-

Rank	Name	Nature of Evidence
NIL		

A. Prosecution Exhibits :-

Sr. No.	Exh. Nos.	Description of Documents.
01.	P-19/PW-01	Complaint
02.	P-21/PW-02	Spot Panchnama
03.	P-24/PW-03	Panchnama dated 30/06/2023
04.	P-27and 28/PW-04	Certificates U/sec.65/B Evidence Act. Muddemal Receipt
05.	P-30/PW-05	Seizure Panchnama

06.	P-52/PW-15	Vehicle Particulars
07.	P-53/PW-15	Letter dated 03.07.2023
08.	P-57/PW-16	Letter dated 03.07.2023
09.	P-58/PW-16	Certiicate Inspection of Motor Vehicle
10.	P45	Post-mortem Police Report Admitted by Accused
11.	P46	Advance Certificate Admitted by Accused
12.	P47	Post-mortem Report Admitted by Accused
13.	P48	Inquest Panchnama Admitted by Accused
14.	P54	Death Certificate Admitted by Accused
15.	P55	Insurance Copy Admitted by Accused

B. Defence Exhibits :-

Sr. No.	Exh. Nos.	Description.
NIL.		

C. Court Exhibits :-

Sr. No.	Exh. Nos.	Description.
NIL.		

D. Material Objects :-

Sr. No.	Exh./Art. Nos.	Description.
01	01 & 02	2 Number Plates

::J U D G M E N T ::

(Delivered on 03th July 2026)

The accused prosecuted of the offences punishable under section 304-A, 279, 337, 338, 420, 465, 468 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short the Code) and u/s.3(1) r/w181,184,146 r/w.196, and 192 of Motor Vehicle Act.

Prosecution case in precise is as under:-

02. On 29.06.2023 deceased Hemraj Patil was proceeding towards Khopoli side from Pali on Bajaj Platina motor cycle bearing registration No. MH 06 BF 5564 along with his wife Minabai. At around 10.40 am. Pravin Salunkhe was driving Hyundai i20 Asta and he was going towards Pali from Khopoli side in a Car bearing registration No.MH-06-BV-7786. Pravin Salunkhe drove his vehicle in rash and negligent manner and drive towards wrong side of the road and dashed to motor cycle of Hemraj Patil. Therefore, Hemraj Patil and his wife sustained simple and grievous injuries. Hemraj Patil died on the spot and Minabai Patil was taken at Hospital.

03. On 29.06.2023 at 10.52 am Pradip Patil received a phone call from Nilesh Belose and he went at the spot, he found accident of Hemraj Patil he was lying besides Pali-Khopoli road. His sister Meenabai was lying in front of gate on road. Both injured were taken at Pali Primary Hospital, Pali for treatment. Hemraj Patil was declared dead. After 2-3 days of treatment at Panvel hospital Meenabai was declared dead. Accordingly, Pradip

Eknath Patil lodged First Information Report at Pali Police Station on 29.06.2023.

04. On the basis of said information C.R.No.99/2023 came to be registered. The In-charge of police station handed over investigation to Smt. Sarita Chavan, Police Inspector. She prepared panchnama. She investigated crime collected medical certificates, injury certificate and recorded statement of witnesses.

05. It was transpired during the investigation that accused drove his i20 Asta in a rash and negligent manner and dashed to Platina motor cycle and resulted into grievous and simple injuries to Hemraj Patil and Minabai Patil and caused death of Hemraj. Minabai Patil died during treatment at MGM Hospital on 03.07.2023. It was transpired accused was driving a car which was having a number plate having number painted on it MH 06 BV 7786. However, said registration number was registered with vehicle of Multiventure Agro and Infrastructure. It appears, without registration of vehicle accused drove motor car on public road with an intention to cheat. Called report from RTO. Prepared panchanama regarding seizure of number plate and finding engine and chasis number. Collected evidence, recorded statement of witnesses. Investigating officer submitted report under Section 173 of the Code of Criminal Procedure against accused under section 304-A,279,337,338,420,465 and 468 of Indian Penal Code and Section 3(1)r.w.181,184,146 r.w.196 and 192 of Motor vehicle Act.

06. Ld. Predecessor recorded particulars of offence under Section 251 of Code of Criminal Procedure. The substance of accusation read over and explained to him in regional language. The accused pleaded not guilty and submitted to make defence. Statement of the accused vide section 313 (1) (b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 recorded at Exh.65. Accused takes defence that false case is registered against him.

07. I have gone through the record and heard both ld. advocates, following points arise for my determination and I have recorded my findings and reasons against each of them given as under.

Sr. No.	Points	Findings
01.	Whether prosecution proves that, on 29/06/2023 at about 10.40 hrs., On Pali-Khopoli Road, Village-Chive, infront of Music City, accused drove his i20 Asta Hundai vehicle bearing registration no. MH-06-BV-7786 in a manner so rash or negligent as to endanger human life ?	Negative
02.	Whether prosecution proves that, on the aforesaid date, time and place, accused drove his aforesaid vehicle so rashly and negligently as to endanger human life and caused death of Hemraj Patil and Minabai Patil?	Negative
03.	Whether prosecution proves that, on the aforesaid date, time and place, accused drove his aforesaid vehicle so rashly and negligently as to endanger human life and causing simple injuries to Hemraj Patil and Minabai Patil ?	Negative
04.	Whether prosecution proves that, on the aforesaid date, time and place, accused drove	Negative

	his aforesaid vehicle so rashly and negligently as to endanger human life and causing grievous injuries to Hemraj Patil and Minabai Patil ?	
05.	Whether prosecution proves that, on the aforesaid date, time and place, accused found with i20 asta car having a fake number plate MH 06 BV 7786 and used such car with an intention to cheat ?	Negative
06.	Whether prosecution proves that, on the aforesaid date, time and place, without registration of vehicle and obtaining registration number used such vehicle by affixing a forged number ?	Negative
07.	Whether prosecution proves that, on the aforesaid date, time and place, accused used such fake number plate on his vehicle and used such vehicle with an intention to deceive ?	Negative
08.	Whether prosecution proves that, on the aforesaid date, time and place, accused drove his aforesaid vehicle on public road without license ?	Affirmative
09.	Whether prosecution proves that on the aforesaid date, time and place, accused drove his aforesaid vehicle in a speed or in a manner which is dangerous to the public ?	Negative
10.	Whether prosecution proves that on the aforesaid date, time and place, accused used vehicle on road without registration ?	Affirmative
11.	Whether prosecution proves that on the aforesaid date, time and place, accused drove his aforesaid vehicle without insurance policy ?	Affirmative
12	What order ?	As per final order

:-REASONS:-**POINT NOS.1 TO 4 :-**

08. In order to prove the offence punishable under section 304-A prosecution has to prove death of a person, failure to exercise the degree of care and caution which is expected from ordinary person and act not amount to culpable homicide.

09. To prove offence under section 279, of Indian Penal Code rash and negligent driving on public way and such rash and negligent driving. In this regard the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Ravi Kapur Vs. State of Rajasthan reported in 2012 Cri.L.J. 4403** laid down following essential conditions they are as follows

“preliminary conditions thus, are that -

(a) it is the manner in which the vehicle is driven,

(b) it be driven either rashly or negligently, and

(c) such rash or negligent driving should be such as to endanger human life. Another parameter, applied is of “reasonable care” in determining the question of negligence or contributory negligence”.

10. To prove the offence of accident it is necessary to bring on record circumstances of road and actual condition of place of accident just after accident. For that purpose prosecution relied on evidence of Spot Panchnama.

11. Kiran Sajekar (Pw-2) deposes on 29.06.2023 he went near gate of Music City and he found vehicle having a number

plate MH06 7786 and two wheeler platina. In presence of him police prepared panchnama by measuring road. He proved Spot Panchnama(Ex.21). During his cross-examination he admitted no contents regarding distance from both ends of road from spot of incident recorded in Panchnama.

12. It appears, panchnama was prepared in presence of the witness. After perusal of panchnama it appears width of road at the spot of incident is 24 feet and at the both ends of road 4.7 ft. rough road (sidepatti) is available. Thus, it appears almost width of road considering cement and rough road is almost 30 ft. It appears from spot panchnama besides road at distance of 35 ft there was hoarding of City of Music and a white colored hyundai i20 Asta car seems to be dashed to the iron pole of hoarding and that iron pole seems to be bended. At 45 feet distance from the spot of incident Bajaj Platina vehicle bearing no. MH 06 BF 5564 appears to be lying there. No tyre marks found on the road.

13. Pradip Patil (Pw-1) deposes on 29.06.2023 he received a phone call and came to know that villagers from his village suffered accident. He went near Music City and he found his cousin sister Minabai and Hemraj were lying there. He found four wheeler vehicle dashed to motorcycle. Hemraj Patil was died on the spot of incident. They took injured Meenabai at hospital but he came to know that Meenabai died in hospital on 2nd July. He lodged report (Ex.19). During his cross examination he failed to depose where actually accident happened. When he went there injured were not moved from the place of accident.

14. Besides that, it appears, Nilesh Mahadik(Pw-4) captured photographs while preparing spot panchanama accordingly, he produced on record certificate u/s.65-B of Indian Evidence Act and produced on record photographs at article “ अ ते ई” . It can be gathered from evidence of Ramesh Gaikwad (Pw-6) he is working as a security guard at Music city and he came out on hearing sound of accident. Witness Prashant Patil (Pw-10) went at the spot of incident near Music City at village Chiwe. It appears, investigating officer deposes she prepared panchnama(Ex.21) in presence of two panch.

15. Thus, considering entire evidence it appears, spot of incident is near Music City. Even after the dash four wheeler car went beside road and dashed to the iron pole of hoarding. Thus, it indicate four wheeler car went beyond the road.

16. However, considering evidence of witnesses it is no where appeared in evidence from which side motor cycle was proceeding and at which side four wheeler vehicle was proceeding. However, it appears, complainant proved his report(Ex.19) and it appears Hemraj Patil was proceeding from Pali towards Khopoli side of road and accused was seems to be driving his vehicle from Khopoli side to Pali and same has been depicted in the spot panchnama. However, there is no eye witness to this. However, it appears first information report is not a substantive evidence and it needs corroboration. It appears to prove direction of moving vehicle needs direct evidence. There is

no direct evidence regarding moving directions of vehicles involved in accident.

17. However, it appears Ld. Advocate for the prosecution argued accused was driving his i20 car from Khopoli to Pali and just after incident a security guard, namely Ramesh Gaikwad (Pw-6) found accused at the spot of incident and deposes he came to know that four wheeler vehicle was driving Pravin Salunkhe(accused). In this regard ld. Advocate for the accused submitted accused not deny that, he was driving i20 car involved in the accident. Thus, it appears accused was driving the car i20 and it is undisputed.

18. After considering evidence in entirely Samadhan Patil(Pw7), Sharad Patil (Pw9), Prashant Patil(Pw10), Dilip Patil(Pw-11) and informant Pradip Patil(Pw-1) they reached at the spot of incident after incident. Thus, their evidence is not direct.

19. However, evidence Ramesh Gaikwad (Pw6) is relevant in respect of effect of incident. He reached at the spot of incident just after the incident. Thus, it appears i20 car dashed to iron pole of hoarding of Music City and he found motor cycle, two injured were lying on the road. Thus, his evidence is sufficient to infer that, i20 car dashed to the motor cycle and a iron pole of hoarding.

20. It appears from first information report (Ex.19) accused was proceeding from Khopoli side to Pali and motor cycle riders were proceeding from Pali to Khopoli side of road. Thus, it can be gathered from spot panchnama i20 car found at the wrong

side of the road and even went beyond road and dashed to the iron pole of hoarding of Music City. Thus, it appears car went towards wrong side of the road.

21. Ld. Advocate for the accused argued that, there is no eye witness to the incident, besides that, accused was driving his motor car to his side of the road, and motor cycle came in a rash and negligent manner at wrong side of the road and dashed to i20 car of the accused and consequently accused lost his control on car and went towards wrong side of the road and dashed to iron pole of hoarding.

22. Spot panchnama proved Car dashed to the iron pole which was situated towards western side of road and car was moving from north to south towards Pali. Thus, it went at the wrong side of the road is proved. However, contentions raised by the advocate of the accused that, due to dash of a motorcycle accused lost his control and car went at wrong side of the road. At the same time there is no direct evidence regarding car went towards wrong side of the road and dashed motorcycle. It is not disputed that, Hemraj Patil and Meenabai Patil lost their lives in the incident due to simple and grievous injuries. However, contentions raised by the ld. Advocate for the accused draw attention and cannot be discarded.

23. It appears from decision of Hon'ble High Court in **Mahendra Madhukar Jagdale Vs. State of Maharashtra reported in 2020 All MR(Cri) 1949** It is held that where there is no direct evidence about manner of driving, under such circumstances

attending circumstances can be gathered from circumstantial evidence such as spot panchnama.

24. In the case of Vishwanath S/o.Kondiba Jinke Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Rev.App.136/2017, (Bomabay High Court, Aurangabad Bench) it appears in this case place of impact to vehicle not ascertained from eye witness and spot panchnama. Thus it is held that it is held that the exact place of impact on road between bus and the motorcycle has not been stated by the eye witness. It cannot be gathered from spot panchnama. Thus, rash and negligent act is not gathered from the Spot panchnama. In present case spot panchnama is not sufficient collect evidence to show that accused drove his vehicle in a rash and negligent manner.

25. In this case prosecution failed to point out exact spot of accident i.e. impact. Thus, spot panchnama alone is sufficient to gather res-ipso locutor but it is not sufficient to infer vehicle driven by rash and negligent act and responsible for death of Hemraj and Meenabai Patil.

26. Merely because a vehicle of the accused dashed to pole of Music city which is wrong side of the car it cannot be inferred that, accused went at the wrong side of road and dashed to motor cycle. In absence of direct evidence evidence of spot panchnama is not sufficient to hold that accused was driving his vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and dashed to the motor cycle of the accused. Thus, this creates doubt. Thus, answer point nos. 1 to 4 in "negative".

POINT NOS.5 TO 7 :-

27. It is the case of the prosecution, accused fixed registration number of vehicle owned by other person and affixed it on his vehicle, used that vehicle on public road with an intention to conceal vehicle's identity and committed cheating, forgery.

28. In this regard prosecution relied on evidence of witness Ramesh Gaikwad (Pw6) who reached at the spot of incident just after incident and found a car bearing registration number MH 06 7786 involved in accident. Besides that, Panchnama (Ex.21) reflect above registration number vehicle was present at the spot of incident.

29. It appears after spot panchnama vehicle used in incident brought at Pali Police Station and in presence of Rahul Kamble(Pw3) and Bhagwan Kalbhor(Pw5) mechanic fastened two number plates from i20 vehicle and accordingly police prepared panchnama(Ex.24). It gathered from evidence of Bhagwan Kalbhor (Pw5) mechanic show him chesis numbers of motor cycle and car and accordingly panchnama(Ex.30) was prepared. However, there is nothing in cross-examination which reflect evidence of these witness can be discarded. Prosecution proved panchnama at ex. 24 and 30. Thus, it reflect that, accused was driving a car i20 having a number plate no. MH 06 BV 7786 and chassi number of that vehicle was MALBM51RLJM618059. It appears mechanic Adnan Sayyad(Pw12) removed carpet at right door of car and he gave chasis and engine number. He removed

number plate from car. Thus, it is proved that accused drove vehicle having a number plate MH 06 BV 7786.

30. To show that, accused was driving a vehicle without having valid registration number prosecution examined Vishnu Sawant (Pw8) it appears he is a driver on a vehicle bearing registration no. MH 06 BV 7786 owned and possessed by Aniket Tatkare and registered with Multi Venture Agro Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. It appears accident was not happened with vehicle he uses. It appears from evidence of Sharad Patil(Pw9) vehicle involved in accident was having a registration number of other vehicle.

31. It can be observed from evidence of Mahesh Devkate (Pw15) he was working as a RTO, Pen and vehicle bearing registration no. MH 06 BV 7786 registered with Multi-venture Agro and Infrastructure on 08.09.2021 and it has chasis no. MA1TA2XM2H24888 and it is Mahindra Scorpio. It can be observed from cross-examination procedure for registration of vehicle before 2021 was different. It appears i20 car was examined by the vehicle inspector on 28.02.2019 but registration of vehicle was not completed by paying registration fee and registration was not complete.

32. It is the case of the prosecution accused used registration number plate which was not registered with his car, despite of that he used forged number plate and used it on his vehicle and attempted to show that accident was happened by the vehicle having registration number 7786. In this regard prosecution examined Akhil Fankar (Pw13).

33. Prosecution examined Akhil Fankar(Pw13) it appears, from his evidence accused purchased i20 vehicle, he gave amount of registration to him. But he expended such amount therefore, vehicle could not register. It appears vehicle owner i.e. determined to obtain registration number 7786.

34. It appears it is the defence of the accused vehicle was inspected by the vehicle inspector at Pen and procedure was initiated but it was not completed. However, it is settled that until and unless process of registration completed vehicle considered to be not registered.

35. No doubt vehicle used on a public way without registration is an offence. However, ld. Advocate for the accused, argued accused used such vehicle without any intention to commit offence. On the other hand he gave amount of registration to Agent Fankar(Pw13) and he failed to register vehicle. Therefore, accused was not aware of non-registration of vehicle. In this regard it appears it appears accused gave amount of registration to Fankar(Pw-13) and Fankar failed to register vehicle by paying amount at the authority. No doubt number plate having a registration no. MH 06 BV 7786 is recovered from the vehicle of the accused and same is proved from the evidence of witnesses.

36. It is the prosecution case that with an intent to cause damage accused cheated and with dishonest, fraudulent intent prepared a false document. In this regard numbers printed on a number plate it self can be considered as a document as per Indian Evidence Act.

37. App for the state argued that, with an intent to cheat false number plate used by the accused thus, his intention was to conceal his identity by using registration number of other vehicle. Advocate for the accused argued accused paid amount of registration to Fankar(Pw13) but he failed to deposit amount and complete registration. In this regard it is suggested that his intention was not to cheat anybody or authority. It is submitted that accused preferred and selected 7786 registration number. But failed to complete registration. However, in this regard it appears motor cycle was also not found to be owned by the Hemraj Patil. It appears Ravindra Sajekar (Pw14) sold such motor cycle to Vijay Diwa and Vijay Diwa sold it to Hemraj Patil. But vehicle was not transferred.

38. However, it appears Fankar(Pw13) informed accused of non registration of his vehicle till 2020 and returned documents. Thus, it appears even after 2020 accused was using the vehicle with having a number plate 7786 which was not allotted to him and not registered.

39. In this regard it appears Hon'ble High Court in **Mahesh Mehervan Havewalla Vs. The State of Maharashtra in Criminal Writ Petition No.1870/2019(Bombay High Court)** in this case the petitioner was driving the vehicle with the number plate of his old car and he has admitted that he has not obtained the registration for the Sunny Nissan car. In this decision hon'ble High court declared person was using his own other vehicles number plate hence offence of forgery would not applicable.

40. In this case the accused is using a number plate of the other person. Thus, it is necessary to find out his "Mens-rea". Thus, it is necessary to consider whether accused was using fake number plate just to conceal his identity, or avoiding challan, toll. However, it appears when accused purchased vehicle he paid amount of registration to Fankar(Pw13) and selected number 7786. However, Fankar failed to make payment to registration to authority hence, not able to obtain such number. Thus, it indicate that, he paid amount with an intention to obtain such number from the authority. This fact of payment of amount of registration paid is proved from the witness Fankar(Pw13). Thus, question arises intention of the accused not found to be such as concealing his identity and using such forged registration number thus, answer point number 5 to 7 in negative.

POINT NOS.8 TO 11 :-

41. It is the case that, accused used vehicle without having driving license, insurance, registration and drove vehicle dangerously on public way. In this regard, it can be said that, accused was having a driving license this fact is within his specific knowledge and he has to prove that, on the date of incident he was having valid driving license. But he failed to produce on record. Hence, prosecution proved accused drove vehicle without license.

42. It is the case of the prosecution, accused drove vehicle dangerously on a public way. In this regard in absence of direct

evidence of driving dangerously. Prosecution failed to prove section 184 of Motor vehicle act.

43. It appears on the day of incident accused was not having a valid insurance of vehicle. It appears insurance of vehicle was since 20.11.2018 to 19.11.2021 and incident happened on 29.06.2023. It appears suggest that accused drove vehicle without having valid insurance. Hence, prosecution proved offence punishable under section 146 read with 196 of Motor vehicle act. Thus, answer point nos. 8,10,11 in affirmative and point nos. 9 in negative.

POINT NO.12:-

44. After considering evidence on record answered point 8,10 and 11 in “affirmative” and point nos. 1 to 7 and 9 in “negative”. Thus, i hold accused guilty under section Sections 3(1) read with 181, 146 read with section 196, 192 of Motor Vehicle Act and proceed to hear accused on the point of sentence.

45. App for the state submitted accused committed crime hence be punished with imprisonment and heavy fine may be imposed.

46. Ld. Advocate for the accused submitted accused is only earning member of his family. It is his first offence. He is not convicted offender. Hence requested for minimum fine.

47. It appears it is the first offence in which he is convicted. Thus, Thus, proceed to pass following order.

:-ORDER:-

- 01 Accused **Pravin Baban Salunkhe**, is acquitted of offences punishable under section 304-A,279, 337,338,420,465 and 468 of the Indian Penal Code and 184 of the Motor Vehicle Act vide Section 255(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.
- 02 Accused **Pravin Baban Salunkhe**, is convicted of offences punishable under Sections 3(1) read with 181, 146 read with section 196, 192 of Motor Vehicle Act vide Section 255(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.
- 03 Accused **Pravin Baban Salunkhe**, is sentenced to pay fine of Rs.5000/- for offence punishable under Sections 3(1) read with 181 of Motor Vehicle Act .
- 04 Accused **Pravin Baban Salunkhe**, is sentenced to pay fine of Rs.4000/- for offence punishable under Sections 146 read with 196 of Motor Vehicle Act.
- 05 Accused **Pravin Baban Salunkhe**, is sentenced to pay fine of Rs.5000/- for offence punishable under Sections 192 of Motor Vehicle Act.
- 06 In default of payment of fine, the accused shall undergo simple imprisonment for 1 month.
- 07 Accused to execute surety bond of Rs.15000/-under section 437-A of Code of Criminal Procedure.
- 08 Muddemal two number plates are worthless hence those be destroyed after appeal period.
- 09 Copy of judgment be provided to accused free of cost .

(Dictated and pronounced in open Court)

Date:-03.07.2026
Pali.

(R.A.Shivratri)
Judicial Magistrate F.C.,Pali