IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.308 OF 2013 IN CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.395 OF 2001

M/s.Pharmaceutical Coatings Pvt.Ltd. ...Applicant

VS.

1.M/s.Harsh Pharma Chem & Ors. ...Respondents.

Mr.Omkar Nagawekar i/b. Mr.Vivek Salunkhe, for Applicant.

Ms.V.S.Mhaispurkar, APP for State-Respondent no.4.

CORAM: M.L.TAHALIYANI, J.

DATED: 30th September, 2013

P.C.:

Heard learned Counsel Mr.Omkar Nagawekar holding for Mr.Vivek Salunkhe for applicant and learned Addl.P.P. Mr.S.S.Pednekar for State-respondent no.4.

- 2. Learned Counsel appearing for applicant submits that the application may be kept back as Mr.Vivek Salunkhe Advocate is busy in another Court. However, in my opinion, it is not necessary to keep back the matter, as it can be decided without appearance of Advocate Mr.Vivek Salunkhe.
- 3. Criminal Revision Application no.395 of 2001 was filed in this Court on 30.11.2001 challenging the order passed by learned Additional Sessions

Judge on 25.7.2001, discharging respondent nos.1, 2 and 3 in Criminal case no.82 of 2000. As such the original criminal complaint case no.82 of 2000 is thirteen years old and the litigation is still pending. What is very pertinent to note here is that the restoration application in dismissed criminal revision application is filed after about three years. In the circumstances, I do not find any merit in the application for restoration of criminal revision application. Hence, application for restoration stands dismissed.

(M.L.TAHALIYANI, J.)