

MHPA030008402016



S.C.C. No.448/2016,
Shriram City Finance Vs. Magdum.

ORDER BELOW EXH.01.

The complainant and his advocate are absent. Record reveals that the case is ten years old. Roznama reflects that as per order below Exh.13 dated 11.12.2024, the complainant was directed to deposit the special bhatta for constable and to file affidavit to that effect without fail. However, the complainant failed to comply the order passed below Exh.13.

2. Today again, despite repeated calling, the complainant and his advocate are absent. No oral or written submission on behalf of complainant. The proceeding is ten years old. This conduct of the complainant shows that he is not interested to proceed with the matter. So, purpose would not be served by keeping a case pending. Hence, I pass following order.

ORDER

The complaint is dismissed for want of prosecution and the accused is acquitted from the alleged offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 vide Section 256 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

Date:28.07.2026

Sd/-
(A. A. Kulkarni),
Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Parbhani.