

Before Hon'ble 2<sup>nd</sup> ACJM CJ

Nagpur

RCC : 147/2002 F/F 25/3/26

Sh/Sunil Kedar.

Reply of Prosecutors on Exhibit 3801

Your Honour.

1) This application is strongly opposed on following grounds.

1) It is pertinent to note that the title given to para no (4) is not just & proper & it only create confusion between split up trial or Separation of trial.

2) It is submitted that this accused have earlier filed an application before this Hon'ble Court for split up of chargesheet which was refused by this Court & on 16.4.24 & on 18.11.24 by the order of this Court was upheld by Hon'ble Session Court & finally the order of Hon'ble High Court Nagpur bench dismiss the Criminal writ petition in same

2] It is pertinent to note further that ~~this~~ in present case the chargesheet was filed came to be filed in presence of this accused & both the chargesheet was received by this accused.

3] It is submitted that at the time of receiving both the chargesheet this accused have not taken any objections regarding ~~to~~ that he did not supplied with complete ~~the~~ chargesheet

4] It is pertinent to note further that ~~this~~ this case was ~~sup~~ separated due to the Cr. applications no 628/14 it means till 2014 the accused have not raise any objections ~~for~~ so that he did not supplied with the proper document (including electronic documents)

5] This accused have not even ~~he~~ mentioned ~~signed~~ single word of not supplying of document with ~~it~~ & with the chargesheet.

21.4.2025

That is para no 1.5 of the this application that the Hon'ble High Court under Cri wp no 1009/24 have mentioned regarding de novo trial or to strict compliance of Sec 204 CrPc. It is the accused have wrongly interpreted the language of the ~~the~~ order as passed on 21.4.2025.

1) That the Hon'ble High Court ~~is~~ in its order on para no-12 of its order at 8<sup>th</sup> line stated "Needless to mention that the learned AJM & the prosecution may adopt a modality to avoid any confusion with regard to the exhibit exhibit numbers of the documents and recorded evidence in the trial against other co-accused."

2) It is also pertinent to note that ~~the~~ the document which was seized from this accused or from other accused or from the bank

such as fax, Cheques, letters registers & other document are seized from their office (i) from Home Teach office or from the bank ~~to~~ (the document which was send by this accused to the bank).

9] As mentioned in para no 2.1 of this application "alleged transcripts, Corporate record, software, hardware ~~to~~ & electronic material have seized from their ~~posse~~ possession & only so far as witness statement is concern, it was already supplied to this accused with main charge sheet & supplementary chargesheet.

10] That the list given by this accused in para no 2.3 ~~has~~ <sup>is</sup> not clear as he did not mentioned whether it relate to him or how much it is essential for him.

11] That it is a admitted fact law that the prosecution needs to supp

The documents including electronic evidence to the accused up to 207 Crpc before starting the trial ~~but~~ but in this case the copy of chargesheet was already supply to this accused. The ~~the~~ document seized from his ~~own~~ possession was signed by the authorised person of his own office who have handed over all the documents.

12) That the law of Crpc ~~up to~~ the state that if the document which voluminous the magistrate is restrict to supply the copy & it allow ~~to~~ to inspect the ~~sa~~ but in present case the situation is different & the necessary documents were already supplied to ~~at~~ this accused.

Hence in view above this application is deemed to be rejected

~~at~~

(Signature)  
C.V.C. Chavaria  
P. 1 1 1 1