

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**R/CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION (FOR QUASHING & SET ASIDE
FIR/ORDER) NO. 19118 of 2018**

=====

MAVJIBHAI BHIKHABHAI SORATHIA

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT & ANR.

=====

Appearance:

MR ASHISH M DAGLI(2203) for the Applicant(s) No. 1

MR. KRUNAL K MODI(7321) for the Respondent(s) No. 2

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR for the Respondent(s) No. 1

=====

CORAM:HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE J. C. DOSHI**Date : 12/09/2025****ORAL ORDER**

In the morning, the matter was mentioned by learned advocate Ms. Pratibha Kumavat appearing for learned advocate Mr. Dagli for the petitioner to the effect that she has obtained consent from learned advocate for other side and sought adjournment. However, learned advocate Mr. Modi for the respondent No.2 during the time of mentioning submits that no consent of his is taken. Looking to this scenario, the approach of learned advocate for the petitioner is not befitting to the status of an advocate. This Court cannot expect this kind of approach from the learned advocate for the petitioner. At the time when the matter is taken up, learned advocate Mr. Modi submits that he would have no objection if he has been informed in prior point of time. He submits that he is AOR and one must inform him at least prior in point of time before mentioning. A lot can be observed for the

conduct of learned advocate for the petitioner, however, the Court restrained its words and granted time lastly.

S.O. to 13.11.2025. Interim relief, if any, granted earlier to continue till then.

SHEKHAR P. BARVE

(J. C. DOSHI,J)