

ITEM NO.171

COURT NO.12

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 for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 5141/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 09-03-2026 in CRWP No. 4945/2018 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay]

AJAY RAGHURAM SHETTY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(FOR ADMISSION and IA No. 88212/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 24-03-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. VINOD CHANDRAN

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Karansingh Rajput, Adv.
Dr. Ravindra Chingale, Adv.
Ms. Sumbul Ausaf, Adv.
Mr. Ashish Vernekar, Adv.
Mr. Tarun Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Mahesh Patil, Adv.
Mr. Ravindra Sadanand Chingale, AOR

For Respondent(s) :

Ms. Tulika Mukherjee, Adv./AOR (N/P)
Mr. Beenu Sharma, Adv. (N/P)
Mr. Venkat Narayan, Adv. (N/P)

Mr. Anand Dilip Landge, Adv./AOR
Mr. Chetan Arvind Alai, Adv.

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

Exemption from filing official translation is granted.

We find that, by order dated 30.06.2025 passed in Criminal Writ Petition No. 4945/2018, a Division Bench of the High Court

directed that the interim order passed earlier would continue until the disposal of the writ petition. Reference to the earlier interim order was apropos the order dated 26.11.2024 passed in the said writ petition, whereby the trial Court was directed not to proceed with the case *qua* the petitioner till the next hearing.

This being the situation, we are at a loss to understand as to how the later Division Bench of the High Court, which heard the matter on 09.03.2026, lost sight of the fact that the writ petition had already been admitted and that the interim order therein was directed to continue till the disposal of the case, and directed the matter to be listed under the caption "For Admission" on 23.03.2026 and further directed that the trial Court should proceed against the petitioner expeditiously.

Issue notice, returnable on 21.05.2026.

Mr. Anand Dilip Landge, learned counsel, who is present in Court, waives service and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 3. Hence, notice need not be served on the said respondent. The learned counsel states that he has already filed his Vakalatnama.

Notice on the unrepresented respondents shall be served by all modes, including *dasti*.

Counter affidavit/reply shall be filed within three weeks from today by respondent No. 3 and within three weeks from the date of service of notice by the other respondents.

Rejoinders thereto, if any, may be filed within two weeks thereafter.

The operation of the impugned order dated 09.03.2026 shall remain stayed till the next hearing.

(DEEPAK GUGLANI)
AR-cum-PS

(PREETI SAXENA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)