

ITEM NO.23 Court 6 (Video Conferencing) SECTION II-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.4750/2020

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 16-12-2019 in CRLWP No.47/2012 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay at Nagpur)

RAJKUMAR BAJRANGLAL AGRAWAL Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

RAJSHREE PRADEEP SHEWALKAR/ DESHMUKH & ORS. Respondent(s)

(With appln.(s) for IA No.135145/2020 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS)

Date : 01-03-2021 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE D.Y. CHANDRACHUD
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.R. SHAH

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Nitin Bhardwaj, AOR

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Sachin Patil, AOR
Mr. Rahul Chitnis, Adv.
Mr. Aaditya A. Pande, Adv.
Mr. Geo Joseph, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

- 1 By the order of this Court dated 19 November 2020, the Court declined to interfere with the judgment of the Bombay High Court dated 16 December 2019 insofar as it quashed the FIR instituted by the petitioner. Notice was issued confined to the order for the deposit of costs of Rs 40 lakhs. The

petitioner was directed to deposit Rs 20 lakhs before the High Court within eight weeks and notice was to be issued on the petitioner filing proof of deposit, failing which the Special Leave Petition would stand dismissed.

- 2 An application has been filed on 22 December 2020 by the petitioner for modification of the order on the ground that the petitioner is ready and willing to negotiate with the bank in respect of the repayment of the loan together with interest.
- 3 The petitioner is under an evident misconception. The deposit of Rs 20 lakhs which was directed to be made was in respect of the amount which has been awarded by the High Court against the petitioner towards costs.
- 4 In the circumstances, we see no reason to entertain the interim application for modification of the earlier order, which shall accordingly stand dismissed. The petitioner having failed to abide by the order of this Court dated 19 November 2020, the Special Leave Petition stands dismissed as a result of the self-operative order that was passed. No further directions are necessary.
- 5 The Special Leave Petition is dismissed.
- 6 Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(CHETAN KUMAR)
A.R. - cum - P.S.

(SAROJ KUMARI GAUR)
Court Master