

MHST010000872023 		Received on	:	18.01.2023
		Registered on	:	18.01.2023
		Decided on	:	09.06.2026
		Duration	:	Ys. Ms. Ds. 03 04 22

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE,
SATARA AT : SATARA**

Present : Amit M. Shete,
Additional Session Judge, Satara

Criminal Revision Application No. 5 / 2023

Exh. No.

Shri Jayant Rangnath Kulkarni

Age-73 yrs., Occu. Agriculture/Pensioner

R/o Vidyut Bungalow, Shahunagar, Godoli,

Satara

..... **Applicant**

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

..... **Opponent**

Appearances;

Mr. T.I. Maner, Ld. Advocate for applicant/Accused

Mr. M.H. Oak, Ld. AGP for the Opponent/State

JUDGMENT

(Delivered on 09th day of June, 2026)

1. Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied by the order dt.12.12.2022 passed by learned CJM, Satara below Exh.1 in RCC

(Amit M. Shete)
Addl. Sessions Judge, Satara

No.388 of 2011, the applicant (accused) filed present revision application. By the impugned order, the learned Magistrate was pleased to close the evidence of prosecution.

2. For the sake of deciding present revision application, it is worth to mention that the subject trial was arising out of a crime registered for the offence punishable under Sec.406, 420, 504, 506 r/w 34 of Indian Penal Code. Pending the trial, the accused no.1 got dead due to which the trial got abated against him. The prosecution, during the hearing of the trial, examined in all 12 witnesses and thereafter the prosecution was granted more than sufficient time to secure the presence of witnesses which are proposed for re-examination. However, the prosecution failed to secure the presence and therefore, by impugned order, the evidence came to be closed. Hence, the revision.

3. Gone through the evidence and documents on record. Following points arose for my determination and the same are answered accordingly for the reasons noted thereunder :-

<u>Sr.No.</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Finding</u>
1.	Whether the learned CJM erred while closing the evidence of prosecution warranting interference?	No.
2.	What order ?	As per final order.

: REASONS :

As to Point no.1 and 2 :-

4. As noted above, the trial is arising out of crime bearing CR

No.443 of 2008 registered with Satara City police station for noted offences. The prosecution examined in all 12 witnesses and the hearing was pending for re-examination. The record shows that the trial was time bound by an order dt10.10.2022 passed by the then Principal District Judge, Satara. Thereafter, the extension was sought for disposal of the trial on which, the then Principal District Judge, Satara extended the time vide order dt.01.12.2022.

5. The prosecution was called upon by the Chief Judicial Magistrate to proceed with the trial in the garb of order passed by the then Principal District Judge, Satara. The record further shows that despite granting more than sufficient time, the prosecution failed to examine or re-examine the witnesses as per their desire. That apart, as per CIS report, the subject trial concluded on 21.12.2022 in conviction. Thus, that way present revision application has rendered infructuous. Thus, I answer the point accordingly and pass following order :-

: O R D E R :

1. The revision application stands dismissed.
2. Pending applications, if any, stands disposed off.

Dictated and pronounced in open Court.

SATARA.
Dt.09.06.2026

(Amit M. Shete)
Additional Sessions Judge, Satara.