

SSK

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 2439 OF 2013**

Dakshata ShetPetitioner-in-person
versus
Matoshree Infrastructure Pvt.Ltd. And ors.Respondents

Ms. Dakshat Shet, petitioner-in-person.
Mr. N. N. Bhadrashete, advocate for respondent No.1.
Mr. J. P. Yagnik, APP for the State.
Mr. U. V. Kejriwal i/b. Mr. Rajesh Desai, advocate for respondent No.5.
Mr. H. C. Pimple i/b. V.H.Deshpande and K.N.Gaikwad, advocate for respondent No.6.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.**

DATED : 29th JUNE, 2015.

P.C.:

Heard the petitioner-in-person, learned counsel and learned APP appearing for the respective parties.

2. The petition is filed seeking direction for registration of FIR in respect of the petitioner's complaint, a copy of which is annexed at "Exhibit C", page 176.

3. Mr. Yagnik, learned APP, having taken instructions from the officer concerned, makes a statement that similar allegations were also made by one Satish Umesh Prabhu, and on the basis of his complaint,

C.R.No.40 of 2013 was registered under Sections 465, 466, 468, 471 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and after investigation of the said C.R., C summary report has been filed in the concerned Magistrate's Court and the same has been accepted.

4. The petitioner-in-person contends that the allegations made in her complaint and allegations made by Satish Umesh Prabhu are different and that her complaint referred hereinabove has not been inquired into.

5. In the above circumstances, the petitioner is at liberty to give her statement to Senior Police Inspector, Navghar Police Station, Mulund, who shall look into the petitioner's grievance and hold preliminary inquiry and take an appropriate decision within seven days from the date of filing of the complaint and communicate the same to the petitioner.

6. In view of the above direction, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)