

Order Below Exh.253 in Sessions Case No.3/2024

01. This adjournment application is filed by advocate for accused Nos.2,4,5, and 7.

02. Ld.Adv.Shri Ajinkya Jadhav for accused Nos.2,4,5, and 7 orally submitted that his senior advocate is busy in the Court at Kolhapur and adjournment be granted for argument on discharge application.

03. Whereas Ld.AGP Shri M.H.Gramopadhye submitted that on the last date matter was for argument on discharge application. However, as per request of advocate for the accused matter was kept on today. He submitted that even though advocate for the accused orally submitted that due to his senior advocate is busy in Court at Kolhapur, he is seeking adjournment. However, in the application said reason is not mentioned. In the application it is mentioned that accused No.3 has filed discharge application and prosecution has to file say to it. So both discharge applications be heard at one and the same time. He submitted that he is ready to argue the application and if advocate for accused is not ready to argue the discharge application, necessary orders be passed on discharge application.

04. Complainant Vijay Patil is personally present before the Court. He raised strong objection for granting adjournment because on the last date advocate for the accused sought adjournment only to protract the matter and if the application is not decided today, he will sit on agitation and so application be rejected.

05. While perusing the proceeding it appears that accused Nos.2,4,5 and 7 filed discharge application at Exh.243. Prosecution filed say to said application at Exh.248. Thereafter, on 30.04.2024 Ld.Adv.Shri Ajinkya Jadhav for accused Nos.2,4,5 and 7 orally submitted that matter be kept for argument on discharge application on 13.05.2024 and on that day his senior advocate will argue on the

application. In view of his oral submission on last date matter was adjourned and kept on today for argument on discharge application.

06. Adv.Shri Ajinkya Jadhav orally submitted that his senior advocate is busy in Court at Kolhapur. However, in the adjournment application said ground is not mentioned. In the adjournment application it is mentioned that accused No.3 has also filed discharge application today and after prosecution filing say both applications be heard at one and the same time and so adjournment be granted.

07. Matter is more than 10 years old. Complainant is senior citizen. On last date as per oral submission of advocate for the accused matter was kept on today as per convenience of his senior advocate. The ground mentioned in the application is not just and proper to adjourn the matter. Application is filed only to protract the matter. Hence, following order is passed :-

ORDER

1. Application is rejected.

VITA

Date : 13-05-2024

**(D.Y.GAUD),
District Judge – 1, Vita.**

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that, the contents of this PDF File Order are same, word to word, as per the original order.

Name of Stenographer	S.V.Agnihotri, Stenographer Grade - I
Name of Court	District Judge-1 & Addl Sessions Judge,Vita.
Date of Order	13.05.2024
Judgment / order signed by the Presiding Officer	13.05.2024
Order uploaded on	14.05.2024

