

MHNS220025352021 	Received on	29.06.2021
	Registered on	29.06.2021
	Decided on	30.07.2026
	Duration on	05Y 01M 01D

IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE F.C.
AT MANMAD RAILWAY, DISTRICT- NASHIK

[Presided over by H.B.Pardeshi]

JUDGMENT

(Delivered on 30.07.2026)

RCC No. 98/2021

Exh. No-23

Details of FIR	C.R.No.02/2021, RPF Manmad
Complainant/ Prosecution	Railway Protection Force, Shirdi
Represented by	Shri. A.K. Singh for the RPF
Accused	Aniket Balu Chide, Age-21 years, Occ: -- Labour, R/o: IUDP, Manmad Dist.Nashik
Represented by	Adv. P.M.Sansare

Date of offence	15.05.2021
Date of FIR	15.05.2021
Date of Final Report	29.06.2021
Date of framing of Charge	--
Date of commencement of evidence	--
Date on which judgment is reserved	--
Date of the Judgment	30.07.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	<u>As per final order</u>

Accused Details

Rank of	Name of accused	Date of Arrest	Date of Release on Bail	Offences charged with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence Imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Section 428, Cr.P.C.
	Aniket Balu Chide	15.05.2021	16.05.2021	U/s.3(a) RPUP Act 1966 and U/s. 147 of Railway Act.	Convicted	Nil	NA

LIST OF PROSECUTION/ DEFENCE /COURT WITNESSES

A. Prosecution:-

RANK	NAME	Exhibit	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
Nil			

B. Defence Witnesses, if any:-

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
Nil		

C. Court Witnesses, if any:-

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
Nil		

LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT EXHIBITS.

A. Prosecution:-

SR.NO.	Description	Exhibit No.
Nil		

B. Defence:-

SR.NO.	Description	Exhibit No.
Nil		

C. Court Exhibits:-

SR.NO.	Description	Exhibit No.
Nil		

D. Material Objects:-

SR.NO.	Description	Exhibit No.
Nil		

J U D G M E N T(Delivered in open Court on this 30th of July 2026)

1. This is a regular trial case filed otherwise than on police report alleging offence punishable u/s 3(a) of the RPUP Act, 1966 and U/s. 147 of Railway Act.
2. The accused made an application u/s 265-B of the Cr.P.C. accompanied with affidavit stating that he is voluntarily preferred said application after understanding the nature and extent of punishment provided under the law for the offence in question. I have called Ld. APP and IPF, Manmad for the RPF in the case. Accordingly, they appeared and the process of mutual satisfactory disposition have been carried out between the participants. After mutual satisfactory disposition, the participants are voluntarily come to the amicable settlement. Resultantly, mutual satisfactory disposition has been successfully resulted into report (Exh.22) u/s 265-D of the Cr.P.C.
3. To verify whether present case is fit for plea bargaining, I have gone through the punishment provided for offence alleged.

This offence is not provided imprisonment more than seven years. The offence does not affect socio economic condition of the Country or has been committed against the woman, or a child below age of fourteen years. In addition to that, the offences do not hit notification S.O. 1042(E) dated 11.07.2006 issued by the Central Government. The amount of theft involved in the crime is Rs.920/-. Thus, I find this case fit for plea bargaining.

4. I have again verified from the accused that whether he really wants to plead guilty to which the accused answered in affirmative. Therefore, I have heard Ld. APP for the RPF on the point of sentence. He has submitted that both parties have arrived at amicable settlement through plea bargaining process therefore, prayed that the railway may be compensated and the accused released on admonition or bond of good behavior. Ld. counsel for the accused submitted that the accused is young age, from poor economic background. He is doing labour work. He further submitted that he is only bread winner of his family and therefore prayed for release him without any sentence of imprisonment.

5. It is to be noted that the accused honestly admitted his guilt. No criminal antecedent of the accused on record let alone contentions of the prosecution in this regard. On the contrary, the prosecution itself submitted that benefit of the Probation Act may be given to the accused as per the procedures. Therefore, considering the provisions of the plea bargaining, object of the Probation Act,

circumstances of the case including the nature of offence, antecedent and economic condition and age of the accused, in my view this is a fit case to grant the benefit of section 4 of the Probation Act. Resultantly, the following order:

Order

- 1] The case is disposed of through plea bargaining process vide section 265(E) of Cr.P.C.
- 2] The accused is convicted of the offence punishable u/s. 3(a) of the RPUP Act vide section 265(E) of Cr.P.C.
- 3] The accused instead of sentencing is released on his personal bond of good behavior for six months vide section 4 of the Probation Act r/w section 265(E) of Cr.P.C.
- 4] The accused is directed to pay Rs.1,000/-towards cost of the proceeding and Rs.5,000/- each towards compensation to the Indian Railway in view of section 5 of the Probation of Offender Act and in default to suffer simple imprisonment for 01 Month.
- 5] The bail bonds of the accused stand surrendered.
- 6] The seized muddemal in the case be handed over to the concerned Railway Department.
- 7] The accused convicted and released as per above clauses shall not subject to disqualifications or disabilities imposed because of the conviction in view of provisions of section 12 of the Probation of Offenders Act, 1958.

Sd/---

(H. B. Pardeshi)

Date : 30.07.2026.

Railway Magistrate, Manmad.

Certificate

I affirm that contents of this PDF file of this judgment are same and word for word as per original judgment.

Name of Clerk : Shri. S. C. Kulkarni (Jr. Clerk)

Name of the Court : Railway Court, Manmad

Upload on date : 30.07.2026.