



महाराष्ट्र शासन राजपत्र असाधारण भाग आठ

वर्ष ४, अंक ५५ (२)]

बुधवार, जुलै १८, २०१८/आषाढ २७, शके १९४०

[पृष्ठे ११, किंमत : रुपये २७.००

असाधारण क्रमांक १११

प्राधिकृत प्रकाशन

महाराष्ट्र विधानमंडळाचे अधिनियम व राज्यपालांनी प्रख्यापित केलेले अध्यादेश व केलेले विनियम आणि विधि व न्याय विभागाकडून आलेली विधेयके (इंग्रजी अनुवाद).

In pursuance of clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India, the following translation in English of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Maharashtra Amendment) Bill, 2018 (L.A. Bill No. LVII of 2018), introduced in the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly on the 18th July 2018, is hereby published under the authority of the Governor.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Maharashtra,

RAJENDRA G. BHAGWAT,
I/c. Secretary (Legislation) to Government,
Law and Judiciary Department.

L. A. BILL No. LVII OF 2018.

A BILL

further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, in its application to the State of Maharashtra.

2 of
1974. WHEREAS it is expedient further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, in its application to the State of Maharashtra, for the purposes hereinafter appearing; it is hereby enacted in the Sixty-ninth Year of the Republic of India as follows:—

1. This Act may be called the Code of Criminal Procedure (Maharashtra Short title. Amendment) Act, 2018.

Amendment
of section 24
of Act 2 of
1974.

2. In section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as “the said Code”),—

(a) after sub-section (8), the following sub-section shall be inserted, namely:—

“(8A) The District Magistrate also, on the recommendation of Superintendent of Police or Commissioner of Police, as the case may be, may appoint for the purposes of any case or class of cases, a person who has been in practice as an advocate for not less than ten years and whose name is included in a panel approved by the State Government, as a Special Public Prosecutor, if he is satisfied, having regard to the nature of the case, gravity of the matter and public interest involved in the matter, that the appointment of Special Public Prosecutor is necessary.”;

(b) in sub-section (9), for the words, brackets and figures “sub-section (7) and sub-section (8)”, the words, brackets and figures “sub-section (7), sub-section (8) and sub-section (8A)”, shall be substituted.

Amendment
of section 25-A
of Act 2 of
1974.

3. In section 25-A of the said Code, in sub-section (6), for the words, brackets and figure “sub-section (8)” the words, brackets and figures “sub-section (8) or by the District Magistrate under sub-section (8A)” shall be substituted.

Amendment
of section 26
of Act 2 of
1974.

4. In section 26 of the said Code, in clause (b), in sub-clause (ii), after the words “be triable” the words “or by any Court superior in rank to such Court” shall be added.

Amendment
of section 64
of Act 2 of
1974.

5. In section 64 of the said Code, the word “male” shall be deleted.

Amendment
of section 102
of Act 2 of
1974.

6. In section 102 of the said Code, in sub-section (3), in the proviso, for the words “five hundred rupees” the words “one lakh rupees” shall be substituted.

Amendment
of section 126
of Act 2 of
1974.

7. In section 126 of the said Code,—

(1) in sub-section (1),—

(a) in clause (c), for the word “child” the words “child, or” shall be substituted;

(b) after clause (c), the following clause shall be added, namely:—

“(d) where his father or mother or the person referred to in clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 125 resides.”;

(2) in sub-section (2),—

(a) before the existing proviso, the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:—

“Provided that, the examination-in-chief of the party and witness shall be on affidavit and the evidence (cross examination and re-examination) of the witness in attendance, whose evidence (examination-in-chief) by affidavit has been furnished to the court, shall be taken by the Magistrate.”;

(b) in the existing proviso, for the words “Provided that” the words “Provided further that” shall be substituted;

(c) after the existing proviso, the following proviso shall be added, namely:—

“Provided also that, it shall be lawful for the Magistrate to serve notice to the opponent at the expenses of the applicant by delivering or transmitting a copy thereof by registered post acknowledgment due, addressed to the opponent or his agent empowered to accept the service or by speed post or by such courier services as are approved by the High Court or the Court of Sessions or by any other means of transmission of documents including fax message or electronic mail service or any other electronic media which contains a provision for confirmation of service provided by the rules made by the High Court.

When an acknowledgment or any other receipt purporting to be signed by the opponent or his agent is received by the Magistrate or article containing the notice is received back by the Magistrate with an endorsement purporting to have been made by a postal employee or by any person authorized by the courier service to the effect that the opponent or his agent had refused to take delivery of the article containing the summons or had refused to accept the notice when tendered or transmitted to him by any other means specified above, the Magistrate issuing the notice shall declare that the notice has been duly served on the opponent.”.

8. In section 167 of the said Code, in sub-section (2), in the proviso, in clause (a),—

Amendment of section 167 of Act 2 of 1974.

(a) to sub-clause (i), the following proviso shall be added, namely:—

“Provided that, if it is not possible to complete the investigation within the said period of ninety days, the Magistrate may extend the said period up to one hundred twenty days, on the report of public prosecutor accompanied with case diary indicating the progress of the investigation and the specific reasons for the detention of the accused beyond the said period of ninety days, if he is satisfied that the detention of the accused beyond the said period of ninety days is necessary and the Magistrate extending the period shall record adequate and special reasons for so doing;”;

(b) in sub-clause (ii), for the words “ninety days, or sixty days” the words “ninety days or the period so extended or sixty days” shall be substituted.

9. In section 206 of the said Code,—

Amendment of section 206 of Act 2 of 1974.

(1) in sub-section (1), in the proviso, for the words “one thousand rupees” the words “ten thousand rupees” shall be substituted;

(2) in sub-section (2), for the words “one thousand rupees” the words “ten thousand rupees” shall be substituted.

- Insertion of new section 208-A in Act 2 of 1974. **10.** After section 208 of the said Code, the following section shall be inserted, namely:—
- Supply of copies of documents to accused in other cases triable by the Magistrate. **“208-A.** In any case where the proceeding has been instituted otherwise than on a police report, the Magistrate shall without delay, direct the complainant or the prosecution agency to furnish to the accused, free of cost, copies of all documents produced before the Magistrate on which the prosecution proposes to rely:
- Provided that, if the Magistrate is satisfied that any such document is voluminous, he shall, instead of furnishing the accused with a copy thereof, direct that the accused will only be allowed to inspect it either personally or through pleader in Court.”.
- Amendment of section 209 of Act 2 of 1974. **11.** In section 209 of the said Code, in clause (a), for the word “commit,” the words “as soon as possible commit,” shall be substituted.
- Amendment of section 228 of Act 2 of 1974. **12.** In section 228 of the said Code, in sub-section (2), after the words “to the accused” the words “present either in person or through the medium of electronic video linkage and being represented by his pleader in the Court,” shall be added.
- Amendment of section 240 of Act 2 of 1974. **13.** In section 240 of the said Code, in sub-section (2), after the words “to the accused,” the following shall be inserted, namely :-
- “present either in person or through the medium of electronic video linkage and being represented by his pleader in the Court,”.
- Insertion of new sub-heading AA in chapter XIX of Act 2 of 1974. **14.** In Chapter XIX of the said Code, after section 243, the following sub-heading and sections shall be inserted, namely:-
- “AA. Cases instituted on a complaint by public servant, other than police officer, authorized under any Central or State enactment.*
- Compliance with section 208-A. **243-A.** When in any warrant-case instituted on a complaint made by a public servant, other than a police officer, authorized under any Central or State enactment, for the time being in force, to make and prosecute a complaint for the commission of an offence under such enactment, the accused appears or is brought before the Magistrate at the commencement of the trial, the Magistrate shall satisfy himself that he has complied with the provisions of section 208-A.
- When accused shall be discharged. **243-B.** If, upon considering the complaint of such public servant under such enactment and the documents and making such examination, if any, of the accused as the Magistrate thinks necessary and after giving the prosecution and the accused an opportunity of being heard, the Magistrate considers the charge against the accused to be groundless, he shall discharge the accused, and record his reasons for so doing.
- Framing of charge. **243-C.** (1) If, upon such consideration, examination, if any, and hearing, the Magistrate is of the opinion that there is ground for presuming that the accused has committed an offence triable under this Chapter, which such Magistrate is competent to try and which, in his opinion, could be adequately punished by him, he shall frame in writing a charge against the accused.

(2) The charge shall then be read and explained to the accused, present either in person or through the medium of electronic video linkage in the presence of his pleader in the Court and he shall be asked whether he pleads guilty of an offence charged or claims to be tried.

243-D. If the accused pleads guilty, the Magistrate shall record the plea and may, in his discretion, convict him thereon. Conviction on plea of guilty.

243-E. If the accused refuses to plead or does not plead, or claims to be tried or the Magistrate does not convict the accused under section 243-D, the Magistrate shall fix a date for the examination of witnesses; and the provisions of sub-sections (2) and (3) of section 242 shall apply to the case. Evidence for consideration.

243-F. The accused shall then be called upon to enter upon his defence and produce his evidence; and the provisions of section 243 shall apply to the case.” Evidence for defence.

15. In Chapter XIX of the said Code, under the heading “TRIAL OF WARRANT-CASES BY MAGISTRATES”, for the sub-heading, “*B-Cases instituted otherwise than on police report*” the following sub-heading shall be substituted, namely:— Amendment of sub-heading of Chapter XIX of Act 2 of 1974.

“B-Cases instituted otherwise than on police report and complaint by public servant, other than a police officer, authorised under any Central or State enactment”.

16. In section 244 of the said Code, in sub-section (1), after the words “police report,” the words “or a complaint made by public servant, other than a police officer, authorised under any Central or State enactment, for the time being in force”, shall be inserted. Amendment of section 244 of Act 2 of 1974.

17. In section 251 of the said Code,— Amendment of section 251 of Act 2 of 1974.

(1) after the words “appears” the following shall be inserted, namely:—

“either in person or through the medium of electronic video linkage in the presence of his pleader in the Court,”;

(2) the following provisos shall be added, namely:—

“Provided that, if in a summons case the Magistrate has dispensed with the personal attendance of the accused, he may record the plea of the pleader of the accused on his behalf :

Provided further that, if the pleader of the accused proposes to plead guilty, he shall file authorization in writing signed by the accused in that behalf :

Provided also that, when imprisonment forms part of the sentence, the accused shall be required by the Court to attend to hear the judgment pronounced.”.

18. In section 260 of the said Code, in sub-section (1), in clause (c),— Amendment of section 260 of Act 2 of 1974.

(a) in sub-clause (ii), for the words “two thousand rupees” the words “ten thousand rupees” shall be substituted;

(b) in sub-clause (iii), for the words “two thousand rupees” the words “ten thousand rupees” shall be substituted;

(c) in sub-clause (iv), for the words “two thousand rupees” the words “ten thousand rupees” shall be substituted.

Amendment of section 267 of Act 2 of 1974. **19.** In section 267 of the said Code, in sub-section (1), for the words “inquiry, trial” the words “investigation, inquiry, trial” shall be substituted.

Amendment of section 273 of Act 2 of 1974. **20.** In section 273 of the said Code, after the words “in the presence of the accused” the words “either in person or through the medium of electronic video linkage” shall be inserted.

Amendment of section 320 of Act 2 of 1974. **21.** In section 320 of the said Code, in sub-section (2), in the Table,—
(1) before entry relating to section 312, the following entries shall be inserted, namely:—

“Rioting.	147	The person against whom the force or violence is used : Provided that, the accused is not charged with other offence which is not compoundable.
Rioting, armed with deadly weapon.	148	The person against whom the force or violence is used : Provided that, the accused is not charged with other offence which is not compoundable.
Obscene acts and songs.	294	The person annoyed by the obscene acts, songs or words.”;

(2) after entry relating to section 494, the following entry shall be inserted, namely:—

“Cruelty to woman.	498-A	The woman subjected to cruelty : Provided that, the application for compounding shall be supported by an affidavit of the woman subjected to cruelty stating that the marital dispute has been amicably resolved either by resumption of cohabitation with the husband or that the said woman and the accused have worked out any other mutually satisfactory disposition:
--------------------	-------	---

Provided further that, a minimum period of two months shall elapse from the date of request or application for compounding before a Court and the Court may

accept the request for compounding, if none of the parties withdraws the consent for compounding in the intervening period.”;

(3) after entry relating to section 500, the following entry shall be inserted, namely :-

“Criminal Part II of The person intimidated.”.
intimidation, section
if threat be to cause 506
death or grivious,
hurt, etc.

22. In section 321 of the said Code, after the words “in charge of a case may,” the words “on the instruction in writing of the State Government,” shall be inserted. Amendment of section 321 of Act 2 of 1974.

23. After section 323 of the said Code, the following section shall be inserted, namely:- Insertion of new section 323-A in Act 2 of 1974.

“323-A. (1) If, in any inquiry into an offence or a trial before a Magistrate, it appears to him or brought to his notice at any stage of the proceeding before signing judgment that the case is one in respect of which the cross case is filed or pending - Procedure in respect of cross cases.

(a) before the Court of Session, he shall commit it to that Court under the provisions hereinbefore contained and thereupon the provisions of Chapter XVIII shall apply to the commitment so made;

(b) before the Chief Judicial Magistrate or any Magistrate of the First Class, he shall make a reference to the Sessions Judge to assign the said cases for trial to one Magistrate.

(2) When the case is committed to the Court of Session under clause (a) of sub-section (1) or the cases are assigned to one Magistrate under clause (b) of sub-section (1), subject to other provisions of this Code, the Court or Magistrate, as the case may be, shall try the case and cross case one after another in the following manner:-

(i) after the recording of the evidence in the case is completed, arguments shall be heard but judgment shall be reserved;

(ii) after the recording of evidence in the cross case is completed, arguments shall be heard;

(iii) the case and the cross case shall be thereafter simultaneously disposed of by separate judgments.

Explanation.- For the purposes of this section, a case and cross case means the cases arising out of one and the same incident.”.

- Amendment of section 324 of Act 2 of 1974. **24.** In section 324 of the said Code, in sub-section (2), for the words and figures “section 239 or ” the words, figures and letter “section 239, section 243-B or ” shall be substituted.
- Amendment of section 326 of Act 2 of 1974. **25.** In section 326 of the said Code, to sub-section (3), the following proviso shall be added, namely :—
 “Provided that, this section shall apply to summary trials where the Magistrate has not maintained the record as prescribed in section 263 and recorded the substance of evidence as provided in section 264.”.
- Amendment of section 350 of Act 2 of 1974. **26.** In section 350 of the said Code, for the words “one hundred rupees” the words “one thousand rupees” shall be substituted.
- Amendment of section 357-A of Act 2 of 1974. **27.** In section 357-A of the said Code, to sub-section (5), the following proviso shall be added, namely:—
 “Provided that, if the victim or the prosecutrix has been paid the compensation at pre-trial stage and the victim or the prosecutrix does not come before the Court to prosecute the case or, at the trial, does not support the prosecution, the Court may order that the compensation so paid to the victim or prosecutrix may be recovered from the victim or prosecutrix as an arrear of land revenue, if it comes to the conclusion that the victim or prosecutrix has intentionally not appeared before the Court or supported the prosecution at the trial.”.
- Amendment of section 358 of Act 2 of 1974. **28.** In section 358 of the said Code,—
 (a) in sub-section (1), for the words “one thousand rupees” the words “twenty-five thousand rupees” shall be substituted;
 (b) in sub-section (2), for the words “one thousand rupees” the words “twenty-five thousand rupees” shall be substituted.
- Amendment of section 376 of Act 2 of 1974. **29.** In section 376 of the said Code,—
 (1) in clause (a), for the words “one thousand rupees” the words “five thousand rupees” shall be substituted;
 (2) in clause (b), for the words “two hundred rupees” the words “two thousand rupees” shall be substituted;
 (3) in clause (c), for the words “one hundred rupees” the words “one thousand rupees” shall be substituted;
 (4) in clause (d), for the words “two hundred rupees” the words “two thousand rupees” shall be substituted.
- Amendment of section 459 of Act 2 of 1974. **30.** In section 459 of the said Code, for the words “less than five hundred rupees” the words “less than one lakh rupees” shall be substituted.
- Amendment to second Schedule appended to Act 2 of 1974. **31.** In the Second Schedule appended to the said Code, in FORM No. 30, for the brackets and words “(Note.-The amount of fine specified in this summons shall not exceed one hundred rupees)” the brackets and words “(Note.-The amount of fine specified in this summons shall not exceed ten thousand rupees)” shall be substituted.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS

The Committee on Reforms of the Criminal Justice System was constituted by the Government of India, under the Chairmanship of Justice V. S. Malimath, former Chief Justice of Karnataka and Kerala High Courts, and the Member of the Human Rights Commission, to consider measures for revamping the Criminal Justice System. The Committee in its extensive report, amongst the several recommendations, has made following major recommendations,-

(i) to suitably enhance the amount of fines, as the fines prescribed are more than a century ago and value of the rupee has since gone down considerably;

(ii) to simplify judicial procedures and practices and to make the delivery of justice to the common man closer, faster, uncomplicated and inexpensive;

(iii) to make the less serious offences compoundable, to encourage settlement without trial.

The Law Commission of India in its 243rd report has also made recommendations to make the offence punishable under section 498-A of the Indian Penal Code compoundable.

In view of aforesaid recommendations made by the said Committee and the Law Commission of India, the amendments in various sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Act 2 of 1974) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Code") have been proposed to be carried out in its application to the State of Maharashtra.

2. The salient features of the proposed amendments are under,-

(i) section 24 of the said Code provides that the power to appoint Special Public Prosecutor for criminal case vests only with the State. It is experienced that it often becomes difficult and expensive for a litigant living in remote area to apply to the State for appointment of the Special Public Prosecutor. Therefore, it is considered expedient to delegate this power with necessary safeguards to the District Magistrate of each district.

(ii) section 102 of the said Code empowers the Police Officer, who has seized the property suspected to be stolen, to sale it by auction if the said property is subject to speedy and natural decay and its value does not exceed Rs. 500. However, it is experienced that the provision is rarely resorted considering the value of the property. As the value of money has gone down considerably, the Government considers it expedient to enhance the said value. Similarly, the Code defines the petty case as a case relating to offence punishable only with fine not exceeding Rs.1000. But the State Government has increased the fine amounts in respect of trivial offences in various statutes, such as Maharashtra Police Act, Maharashtra Prohibition Act, Mumbai Municipal Corporation Act, etc., which resulted in excluding those trivial offences out of purview of section 206 of the said Code. In order to extend the benefit of the said provision to large number of accused, the need was felt to make suitable modification of the expression 'petty offences'. Further, the amount of penalty of Rs.100 for disobedience of summons and amount of compensation of Rs. 1000 for groundless arrest are felt meagre. Therefore, it is considered expedient to enhance amount of penalty from Rs.100 to Rs. 1000 and compensation for groundless arrest from Rs. 1000 to Rs. 25000.

(iii) section 376 of the said Code bars appeal when the Court imposes fine of certain amount and or imprisonment of certain period. The amount of fine mentioned in the said section has not been modified or enhanced from the year 1973. The Central Government by the amendment Act, 2005 enhanced scope of petty cases under section 206 of the said Code to the offences punishable with fine up to Rs. 1000. It is now proposed to further enhance the said amount of fine up to Rs. 10000. Considering this, in order to bar appeal in petty cases and to minimise the appeal in other cases, it is felt necessary to enhance the amount of fine mentioned in clauses (a) to (d) of section 376 of the said Code. Therefore, it is expedient to enhance the value of property, amount of fine and compensation in sections 102, 206, 260, 350, 358, 376 and 459 of the said Code.

(iv) the object of maintenance proceeding under section 125 of the said Code is to prevent destitution. However, section 126 of the said Code does not provide the major child who is physically or mentally disabled or the father or mother, an option of jurisdiction to file proceeding in the district where they reside. Presently, the said section provides that the applicant has to file such maintenance proceedings within such jurisdiction, where the opponent resides. This appears to be manifestly unfair. The discrimination so made between a destitute wife and parent does not seem to be reasonable. Therefore, it is proposed to remove the said discrimination. Similarly, the maintenance proceeding being quasi-civil in nature, the facility of recording of evidence by affidavit and service of notice by postal and other modes can speed up the hearing of such proceeding. Therefore, it is expedient to make appropriate provisions in the said sections.

(v) the foundation for the Criminal Justice System is the investigation by the police. As per section 167 of the said Code in respect of offences punishable with imprisonment for more than 10 years, the accused is liable to be released on bail if the charge sheet is not filed against him within 90 days from the date of his arrest. It is experienced that it is not always possible to investigate a case comprehensively within this period, particularly, in cases having inter-State or trans-national ramifications or economic offences. This results in accused involved in grave crimes being released on bail. Therefore, it is expedient to extend this period by another 30 days in case of grave crimes, on the report of Public Prosecutor and subject to the satisfaction of the Magistrate and for adequate and special reasons.

(vi) presently, there is no express provision in the said Code providing for supply of copy of documents to the accused in cases instituted otherwise than on police report triable by the Magistrate. To promote fair trial, a provision in that regard was felt necessary. Similarly, the said Code is silent as regards the procedure to consolidate the cross cases, pending in different Courts in one Court for the purpose of trials. The Supreme Court in the case of *Sudhir and Ors. vs. State of M.P.* (2001) 2 SCC 688 emphasized the need for legislation in that regard. Therefore, it is considered expedient to incorporate new sections 208-A and 323-A in the said Code so as to fill the said lacuna.

(vii) the absence of the accused for the purpose of framing charge or recording plea or at the stage of recording evidence often delays the trial. Hence, with the advent of technology to speed up the trial, it is considered expedient to permit the use of said technology, viz. the electronic video-linkage in the Criminal Justice System for the purpose of framing charge, recording plea of the accused or evidence at the trial by suitably amending sections 228, 240, 251 and 273 of the said Code.

(viii) presently, Chapter XIX of the said Code provides for two different procedures for trial of warrant cases by the Magistrate; one for cases instituted on police report and second for cases instituted otherwise than on a police report. The cases filed by the public servant empowered under any Central or State enactment, such as under the Forest Act, 1927, the Customs Act, 1962, the Income Tax Act, 1961, *etc.*, are being treated as cases instituted otherwise than on police reports *i.e.* complaint cases. In such cases, before framing charge the Court has to record the evidence of the complainant and his witnesses. It is experienced that the said two-stage evidence recording procedure leads to the delay of trial. In such cases often the investigation carried by the public servant has the trappings of investigation carried by the police. Therefore, it is considered expedient to do away with the stage of recording of evidence before charge, and to try those cases in accordance with the procedure prescribed for the trial of cases instituted on police report by incorporating a new sub-Chapter therein.

(ix) section 326(3) of the said Code precludes the succeeding Judge to act upon the evidence recorded by his predecessor in summary triable cases. It is experienced that, the practice of recording 'substance of evidence' in summary triable cases is almost obsolete. Even in summary triable cases the Judge records the evidence in full. But in view of bar of sub-section (3) of said section 326, the Judge orders de-novo trial, which results in recall and re-examination of the witnesses. Therefore, it is considered expedient to limit the applicability of bar of said sub-section (3) only to those cases wherein the Judge has maintained the record as prescribed in section 263 and recorded the 'substance of evidence', as prescribed in section 264.

3. The Law Commission in its 142nd and 154th reports made certain recommendations to promote settlement of criminal cases. In its 243rd report the Law Commission has made specific recommendation to make the offence under section 498-A of the Indian Penal Code, compoundable. The Justice Malimath Committee has also suggested that the offences which are not of a serious character and the impact is mainly on the victim and not on the values of the society, should be made compoundable. It is experienced that the offences punishable under sections 147 and 148 of Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred as the "IPC"), which have their genesis in trifling causes, are subsequently compromised. The offences under sections 294 and 506 II of IPC are generally applied by the police on verbal abuse or threats. Many times, the major offences get compromised between the parties, but trial remains pending for the said offences as those are non-compoundable. This results in forcing the litigants to undergo the ordeal of trial. The offence under section 498-A of IPC, arises out of matrimonial discord. Many times, the dispute is resolved between the parties, but as the offence is non-compoundable, the parties have to face the trial. Even when there is reconciliation or disruption of marital bond, the criminal case continues as section 498-A of IPC is non-compoundable. The provision at times, hinders settlement and reconciliation. In view of this, it is felt expedient to make the offences punishable under sections 147, 148, 294, 498-A and 506 Part II of the IPC 'compoundable' with the permission of the Court by amending the provisions of section 320, suitably.

4. The bill seeks to achieve the above objectives.

Nagpur,
Dated the 17th July 2018.

DEVENDRA FADNAVIS,
Chief Minister.