

SSK

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 3232 OF 2015

Ramchandra PurohitPetitioner
versus
State Bank of India and ors.Respondents

with

WRIT PETITION NO. 3233 OF 2015

Ramesh ParekhPetitioner
versus
State Bank of India and ors.Respondents

with

WRIT PETITION NO. 3234 OF 2015

Ms. Darshana MehtaPetitioner
versus
State Bank of India and ors.Respondents

Mr. D. P. Desai, advocate for the petitioners.
Ms. Vinaya J. Chavan, advocate for respondent No.1.
Mrs. M. H. Mhatre, APP for the State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
V. L. ACHLIYA, JJ.**

DATED : 19th AUGUST, 2015.

P.C.:

By these petitions, the petitioners are challenging the orders dated 16th April, 2015, 17th June, 2015 and 1st August, 2015, passed by learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Esplanade, Mumbai.

2. By orders dated 16th April, 2015, the petitioners' applications for intervention came to be dismissed. The petitioners challenged these orders by filing special leave petitions before the Supreme Court. It is

reported that these special leave petitions are pending. The Chief Metropolitan Magistrate thereafter passed orders dated 17th June, 2015 and 1st August, 2015. These orders are consequential orders as contemplated under Section 146 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners relied upon a decision of the Apex Court in **Harshad Govardhan Sondagar vs. International Assets Reconstruction Co.Ltd. and ors. in criminal appeal No.736 of 2014 arising out of S.L.P.(Cri) No.1666 of 2012.** Admittedly, there is no registered instrument in favour of the petitioners. The petitioners claim tenancy on the basis of oral agreement. This decision is not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present cases. Learned counsel for the petitioners also relied upon the order passed by a Division Bench of this Court in writ petition No. 2041 of 2015 and prayed for limited relief. We are not inclined to grant this relief as special leave petitions are pending before the Supreme Court. The writ petitions, accordingly, stands dismissed.

(V. L. ACHLIYA, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)