

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
SUIT NO. 613 OF 2013
ALONG WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1168 OF 2013
AND
MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO. 90 OF 2013
IN
TESTAMENTARY PETITION NO. 820 OF 2012

Niraj Wishwanath Kochhar)
Age 56, an Indian Inhabitant, having his residential)
address at 6th floor, Steesha Apartments, Mount Mary Road,)
Bandra (West), Mumbai-400 050)...Plaintiff

vs.

1. Hemendra Pranjivan Bosmiya, age, adult, occupation-)
Business/Agriculturist, having his office at)
215-B. Shanti Shopping Centre, Mira Road (East),)
Dist. Thane-401 107)
- 2(a) Mumtaz Pyarasaheb Rana,)
Aged 66 years, wife of Defendant No. 2,)
having her address at N.G. Paradise, Building No. 6,)
Flat No. 701, Hatkesh, Mira Road (E),)
Thane-401 107)
- 2(b) Naseem Pyarasaheb Rana,)
Aged 46 years, daughter of Defendant No. 2,)
having her address at N.G. Paradise, Building No. 6,)
Flat No. 701, Hatkesh, Mira Road (E),)
Thane-401 107)

- 2(c) Shajid Pyarasaheb Rana,)
Aged 42 years, son of Defendant No. 2,)
having his address at N.G. Paradise, Building No. 6,)
Flat No. 701, Hatkesh, Mira Road (E),)
Thane-401 107)
- 2(d) Siraj Pyarasaheb Rana,)
Aged 35 years, son of Defendant No. 2,)
having his address at N.G. Paradise, Building No. 6,)
Flat No. 701, Hatkesh, Mira Road (E),)
Thane-401 107)
- (Defendant Nos. 2 (a) to 2(d) are legal heirs of the)
Original Defendant No. 2))
3. Mrs. Manpreet Baldevram Sharma,)
House No. 364, Village Hamirgarh,)
Dhaipai, Tehsil Mansa, District Mansa,)
State of Punjab-151 504)
4. Yasin Roshan Bagwan,)
Bhagtauday Nagar, Lane No.1, Kondwa Kurd,)
Pune-411 048)
also residing at R. No. 35, Dadabhai Narroji Chaw,)
Dr. Ambedkar Road Nagar, Near Premier Theatre,)
Parel, Mumbai-400 012)
5. Nutan Tuli,)
3rd floor, Waverly Bldg., Sarojini Road,)
Santacruz (West),)
Mumbai-400 054)
6. Shibani S. Bhojwani,)
20th floor, Jivesh Terraces, Band Stand,)
Bandra (West), Mumbai-400 050)..Defendants

Mr. Shailesh Shah, Senior Advocate, along with Mr. Ashwin Shete and Mr. Santosh Avhad, instructed by M/s. Jayakar & Partners, for the Plaintiff.

Mr. V.Y. D'Silva, instructed by Mr. P.J. Dubey for Defendant No.1.

Mr. Jahangir Iqbal for Defendant Nos. 2(a) to 2(d).

Mr. R.A. Shah, instructed by M/s. Mansukhlal Hiralal & Co., for Defendant No. 3.

Mrs. Meena A. Fulbandhe for Defendant No. 4.

CORAM: S.J. KATHAWALLA, J.

DATE: 24TH NOVEMBER, 2015

JUDGMENT:

1. In the above Suit, Mr. Niraj Wishwanath Kochhar is the Plaintiff. Defendant No. 1 -- Hemendra Pranjivan Bosmiya is a Builder. Original Defendant No. 2 was Pyarasaheb Keshrisingh Rana. Defendant Nos. 2 (a) to 2 (d) -- Mumtaz Pyarasaheb Rana, Naseem Pyarasaheb Rana, Shajid Pyarasaheb Rana and Siraj Pyarasaheb Rana are the legal heirs of the original Defendant No.2. Defendant No.3 -- Mrs. Manpreet Baldevram Sharma is a resident of Punjab. Defendant No. 4 -- Yasin Roshan Bagwan, claims to be a rickshaw driver from Pune, who is the Constituted Attorney of Defendant No.3. Defendant Nos. 5 and 6 -- Mrs. Nutan Tuli and Shibani S. Bhojwani are the siblings of the Plaintiff.

2. The Plaintiff -- Niraj Wishwanath Kochhar has filed the above Suit for a declaration that the Deed of Conveyance dated 21st November, 2012, executed

by and between Defendant Nos. 1 to 3, pertaining to the property being land situate at Sherly Rajan, near St. Ann's Church, Bandra, in the Revenue Village of Danda, Tal. South Salsette, Registration Sub-District of Bandra, District Bombay Suburban, admeasuring 752 sq.yds. bearing Survey No. 329B (Part) corresponding to CTS No. C/1130; admeasuring 76 square yards equivalent to 42.2 square meters, Survey No. 249, Hissa No. 2 (Part) corresponding CTS No. C/1133; admeasuring 735 1/3 square yards equivalent to 626.3 square meters, Survey No. 249, Hissa No. 1 (Part) corresponding CTS No. C/1131 and; admeasuring 376 sq.yds. equivalent to 314.7 square meters ("Suit Property"), is void ab initio.

3. It is the Plaintiff's case in the Suit that the Plaintiff and the Defendant Nos. 5 and 6 are the only heirs of their mother Chandrakanta alias Kanta Kochhar (now deceased) who was the sole owner of the Suit Property. Defendant No. 3 -- Mrs. Manpreet Baldevram Sharma has illegally and without any authorisation, by use of forged and fabricated document obtained Letters of Administration as the heir of the Plaintiff's mother Kanta Kochhar, and has thereafter purportedly sold the Suit Property to Defendant Nos. 1 and the Original Defendant No.2, without having any rights in the same.

3. The brief facts in the Suit are set out hereunder:

3.1 By a registered Deed Of Conveyance dated 3rd March, 1965, the Plaintiff's late mother -- Mrs. Chandrakanta Wishwanath Kochhar alias Kanta Kochhar purchased the Suit Property from one Oswald D'Souza. The mother of the Plaintiff Kanta Kochhar was put in possession of the Suit property in 1965 itself and since then the members of the Kochhar family have been in exclusive possession of the same.

3.2 On 23rd August, 1978, Kanta Kochhar and one Mrs. Kaushalya Sampat entered into an Agreement for Sale of the Suit Property whereunder she agreed to sell the Suit Property to Mrs. Kaushalya Sampat.

3.3 On 9th April, 1979, Kanta Kochhar terminated the Agreement for Sale dated 23rd August, 1978. In view thereof, Mrs. Kaushalya Sampat filed a Suit being Suit No. 1066 of 1979 in this Court against Kanta Kochhar inter alia for specific performance of the Agreement for Sale dated 23rd August, 1978.

3.4 Kanta Kochhar died intestate on 17th December, 1987, leaving behind her, her husband i.e. Wishwanath Jagannath Kochhar, her son the Plaintiff herein, her daughters, Defendant Nos. 5 and 6 herein and her son Sanjay Kochhar (now deceased), as her only surviving heirs/legal representatives. The Plaintiff has annexed the Death Certificate of his mother Kanta Kochhar which is

marked as Exhibit-I to the Plaint at page 160. The Plaintiff has also relied on the Obituary of his deceased mother in the Times of India, a copy of which is annexed and marked as Exhibit-J and J-1 to the Plaint at pages 161 and 162.

3.5 In the said Suit No. 1066 of 1979 filed by Kaushalya Sampat, Kanta Kochhar had filed her Written Statement dated 17th January, 1983, and after her demise the Plaintiff and Defendant Nos. 5 and 6 also filed a Supplemental Written Statement dated 24th October, 1997.

3.6 After the demise of Kanta Kochhar, her legal heirs i.e. the Plaintiff and his sisters were joined as Defendants in Suit No. 1066 of 1979. In the year 2009, the Plaintiff also filed his evidence in the said Suit. The said suit is subsequently transferred to the City Civil Court and is pending.

3.7 On 25th July, 2010, the father of the Plaintiff and Defendant Nos. 5 and 6 -- Wishwanath Jagannath Kochhar died intestate. A copy of his Death Certificate is annexed as Exhibit-L1 to the Plaint at page 194.

3.8 On 30th March, 2012, Mrs. Manpreet Baldevram Sharma Defendant No. 3 herein, filed Testamentary Petition No. 820 of 2012, before this Court seeking Letters of Administration in respect of the Estate of late Kanta Kochhar. In the said Petition, Defendant No. 3 alleged that she is the daughter of Smt. Kanta

Kochhar and that the said Kanta Kochhar passed away on 15th July, 1991 and her father Wishwanath Kochhar pre-deceased her mother and passed away in the year 1986. Exhibits-A and B to the said Petition filed before this Court are the purported Death Certificates of Kanta V. Kochhar and Wishwanath V. Kochhar respectively, issued by the Gram Sevak, Granpanchayat of Shirasgaon, Trimbakeshwar, Dist. Nashik. Advocate Vincent D'Silva has acted as the Advocate in the said Testamentary Petition on behalf of Defendant No.3 --Manpreet Sharma. Based on the representations made by Defendant No. 3 --Manpreet Sharma in her Testamentary Petition No. 820 of 2012, Letters of Administration dated 10th July, 2012 were issued to Defendant No. 3 in respect of the Estate of late Kanta Kochhar. In the Schedule of Assets to the Letters of Administration, the Suit Property is shown and its value is shown as 10,15,20,000/- (Rupees Ten Crores Fifteen Lacs Twenty Thousand only).

3.9 According to the Plaintiff, on 25th August, 2012, Defendant No. 3 --Manpreet Sharma, along with Defendant No. 4 -- Yasin Roshan Bagwan (who claims to be a rickshaw driver of Pune and the Power of Attorneyholder of Manpreet Sharma) came to the Suit Premises with 10-15 persons and the police along with a Board showing that the Suit Property was in possession of Defendant No. 3 --Manpreet Sharma who was the daughter of Mrs. Kanta

Kochhar. However, Defendant No. 3 --Manpreet Sharma could not take possession on that day as the representative of the Plaintiff prevented her from forcefully trespassing onto the Suit Property.

3.10 On 28th August, 2012, the Plaintiff lodged a Complaint with the Khar Police Station, placing the aforestated facts on record. The Complaint is annexed and marked as Exhibit-O to the Plaint at pages 199-200.

3.11 According to the Plaintiff, thereafter on making enquiries, he learnt that Defendant No. 3 -- Manpreet Sharma had filed Testamentary Petition No. 820 of 2012, wherein she had alleged that she was the only surviving legal heir of late Mrs. Kanta Kochhar and had annexed a death certificate purportedly issued by the Sarpanch of Shirasgaon, Trimbakeshwar, Dist. Nashik, a copy of which is annexed to the said Petition. On the basis of the claims made and documents produced by Manpreet Sharma, the Testamentary Department of this Court had issued Letters of Administration to Defendant No.3 -- Mrs. Manpreet Sharma on 10th July, 2012.

3.12 On 17th September, 2012, the Plaintiff wrote a letter to the Sarpanch of Sirasgaon to verify the genuineness of the death certificate of Kanta Kochhar relied upon by Defendant No. 3 --Mrs. Manpreet Sharma.

3.13 On 18th October, 2012, the Plaintiff filed a Misc. Petition No. 90 of 2013 in this Court for revocation of the said Letters of Administration dated 10th July, 2012 issued to Defendant No. 3 -- Mrs. Manpreet Sharma. The said Petition was also transferred and tagged along with the above Suit.

3.14 On 23rd October, 2012, the Sarpanch of Shirasgaon by his Letter informed the Plaintiff that the death certificates dated 17th December, 1987 and 25th July, 2010 annexed by Defendant No. 3 -- Manpreet Sharma to the Testamentary Petition filed in this Court, and on the strength of which Letters of Administration were obtained from this Court were not issued by his Office.

3.15 Since the Plaintiff had filed a Complaint with the Economic Offence Wing, with regard to the attempt on the part of Defendant No.3 -- Mrs. Manpreet Sharma to grab the Suit Property, the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Economic Offence Wing, by his Letter dated 22nd January, 2013, addressed to the Senior Police Inspector, Khar, with a copy marked to the Plaintiff, directed the Senior Inspector of Police, Khar Police Station to investigate the matter, as a case of land grabbing was made out upon a preliminary enquiry.

3.16 On 4th March, 2013, Defendant No. 3 filed her Affidavit-in-Reply in Misc. Petition No. 90 of 2013 opposing the same. Misc. Petition No. 90 of 2013 was filed by the Plaintiff seeking revocation of the Letters of Administration in

favour of the Defendant No.3. In the said Affidavit, Defendant No. 3 -- Mrs. Manpreet Sharma, disclosed that she has sold the Suit Property to Defendant No.1 -- Hemendra Pranjivan Bosmiya and the original Defendant No. 2 -- Pyarasaheb Keshrisingh Rana on 21st November, 2012.

3.17 On 24th June, 2013, the Plaintiff filed the present Suit before this Court and moved an Application on 6th September, 2013 for urgent ad-interim reliefs. The Plaintiff and Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 contended that they were in possession of the Suit Property. Since the original Defendant No.2 made a statement before the Court that no third party rights are created in respect of the Suit Property and that no third party rights would be created in respect of the same, this Court directed the parties to maintain status quo as on that date.

3.18 According to the Plaintiff, since an incorrect statement was made on behalf of Defendant Nos. 1 and 2, of being in possession of the Suit Property, between 6th September, 2013 and 23rd September, 2013, the Plaintiff regularly took photographs of his guards on the Suit Property and also installed CC TV camera to record the movements on the Suit Property.

3.19 On 11th September, 2013, the Plaintiff had also addressed a letter to the Khar Police Station requesting the Police to provide security at the Suit Property

to avoid any attempts from Defendant No. 1 and the original Defendant No. 2 to forcefully enter into the Suit Property.

3.20 In the morning of 23rd September, 2013, the original Defendant No. 2, along with 70 people, out of which 25-30 were women, forcefully entered into the Suit Property. The Plaintiff's security guards were physically thrown out of the Suit Property by Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 and thereafter the Plaintiff's Board was removed. Two fresh Boards were erected. The Plaintiff's CCTV camera and the recording system were also removed. In view of the above, the matter was mentioned before this Court on 23rd September, 2013, at 11.00 a.m. and the same was taken up at 3.00 p.m. The photographs taken by the Plaintiff qua the conduct of Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 were also produced before the Court. The Court appointed a Commissioner to immediately go to the Suit Property and to submit his report in Court.

3.21 After perusing the Report filed by the Court Commissioner, this Court appointed Court Receiver, High Court, Bombay as Receiver to take symbolic possession of the Suit Property. Three security guards of the Plaintiff and three of the Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 were allowed to stay outside the suit property. The PSI of Khar Police Station was ordered to file his investigation report on 27th September, 2013 at 3.00 p.m.

3.22 On 22nd September, 2013, the original Defendant No. 2 passed away.

3.23 By an Order dated 21st October, 2013, this Court allowed the Plaintiff to bring the legal heirs of original Defendant No.2 on record. Consequent thereto, Defendant Nos. 2 (a) to 2 (d) were brought on record.

3.24 By an Order dated 20th August, 2014, the Plaintiff was allowed to amend the Plaint and the Notice of Motion to bring the subsequent facts on record.

3.25 On 12th December, 2014, the Court Receiver filed his Report stating that he has taken symbolic possession of the Suit Property and has affixed his possession boards on the Suit Property to that effect.

3.26 On 28th January, 2015, Defendant No.1 filed his Written Statement in the above Suit. The legal heirs of Defendant No. 2 filed their Written Statement on 24th July, 2015 and the Defendant No. 3 filed her Written Statement on 29th July, 2015. All the Written Statements are filed through different Advocates. It is clear from the contents of the said Written Statements that all of them are prepared by one person/Advocate for all the parties viz. Defendant No.1, Defendant Nos. 2 (a) to (d) and Defendant No.3.

3.27 On 1st September, 2015, the Plaintiff's Notice of Motion No. 1168 of 2013 was taken up for hearing. On that day, this Court, inter alia, observed that though the Commissioner of Police had addressed a Letter dated 21st January,

2013 to the Senior Inspector of Police, Khar Police Station, to investigate the matter, no investigation appears to have been carried out. In view thereof, this Court directed the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Economic Offence Wing, Crime Branch, CID, Mumbai, to enquire as to why Khar Police Station failed to act on the Letter of the Deputy Commissioner of Police dated 22nd January, 2013, and further directed the Deputy Commissioner of Police to submit his report to this Court on 14th September, 2013 at 3.00 p.m.

3.28 Since the Advocate for the Plaintiff contended before this Court on 2nd September, 2015 that the death certificates produced before this Court by Defendant No. 3 were forged and fabricated and that this fact was confirmed by the Sarpanch vide his Letter dated 23rd October, 2012, and the Advocates appearing for Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 submitted that in fact the letters purportedly issued by the Sarpanch and produced by the Plaintiff are fabricated, the Advocates for both sides were left with no option but to request the Court to ascertain the correct facts from the concerned authorities. This Court therefore directed the Sarpanch and the Gram Sevak, Gram Panchayat, Shirasgaon, Tal. Trimbakeshwar, Dist. Nasik to remain present before the Court on 14th September, 2015 along with the records pertaining to the registration of deaths for the period May 1986 and July, 1991.

3.29 On 14th September, 2015, Mr. Shamkant Panditrao Borse, Gram Sevak, Grampanchayat, Shirasgaon, Dist. Nasik was present in Court. He informed the Court that the death certificate relied upon by the Defendant No. 3 was a fabricated document. He further stated that he had not signed the said certificates and the seal was also fabricated, and was not the one used by the Gram Panchayat. He further informed the Court that the Letter dated 23rd December, 2013, relied by the Plaintiff was issued by the Gramsevak, Grampanchayat, Shirasgaon, Dist. Nashik. In view thereof, this Court directed production of the original Death Register/s pertaining to the years 1986 and 1991 before this Court on 16th September, 2015 at 3.00 p.m. On the same day by another order, Defendant No. 3 - Manpreet Sharma was directed to remain present in Court on 22nd September, 2015 failing which the Court would pass necessary orders to ensure her presence in Court.

3.30 Pursuant to the Order dated 14th September, 2015, Mr. Shamkant Panditrao Borse, Gramsevak, Shirasgaon, Dist. Nasik, appeared before this Court on 16th September, 2015 and produced the original Death Registers pertaining to the years 1986 and 1991. On perusing the Death Register, it was observed by this Court that in May, 1986 there was no death registered in the name of late Mr. Wishwanath Kochhar. Similarly no death was registered in the name of

Kantabai Wishwanath Kochhar in the month of July, 1991. After comparing the relevant pages with the original Death Register, the certified copies were taken on record and the original registers were returned to Mr. Shamkant Panditrao Borse, Gramsevak Shirasgaon.

3.31 Upon the fraud being exposed, the following Affidavits were filed by the Defendants.

3.31.1 Defendant No. 1 filed an Affidavit dated 22nd September, 2015 stating that he had purchased the Suit Property after due diligence as to the Title of Defendant No. 3 in respect of the Suit Property. A search taken with the Office of the Sub-Registrar did not show any lis pendence registered by the Plaintiff indicating the pendency of Suit No. 1066 of 1979. It also did not show any claim nor the names of the Plaintiffs in the revenue records. Therefore, there was no reason for him to doubt the credentials and bona fides of Defendant No. 3. He has further stated that pursuant to the Deed of Conveyance dated 21st November, 2012, he was put in possession of the Suit Property, and that he continues to be in possession of the same. He has submitted that he and the deceased Defendant No. 2 had paid a sum of Rs. 68,96,000/- towards stamp duty on the Deed of Conveyance dated 21st November, 2012. He has stated that

the continuation of the Suit proceedings will not be in his interest and in the interest of Defendant Nos. 2 (a) to 2 (d) and has stated that, "*From the records now it appears that the Plaintiffs could be right in their claim and therefore I honestly do not wish to contest their claim hereafter*".

3.31.2 Affidavits of Defendant Nos. 2 (a) to 2 (d) dated 22nd September, 2015, are identical in all respects to the Affidavit filed by Defendant No.1.

3.31.3 Defendant No. 3 -- Mrs. Manpreet Sharma has filed an Affidavit dated 23rd September, 2015 stating that she is a housewife from Punjab, whose husband is unwell and since financial help was promised to her by deceased Defendant No. 2 through Defendant No. 4 -- Yasin Roshan Bagwan, she had repeatedly acted at the instance of the deceased Defendant No. 2 and the said Bagwan and had put her signatures on the documents as required by the original Defendant No. 2, for which she received an amount of Rs. 3,50,000/-. She has stated in her Affidavit that her father's name is Prakash Chand Sharma and her mother's name is Taravanti P.Sharma.

3.31.4 Defendant No. 4 -- Yasin Roshan Bagwan has also filed his Affidavit. He too has stated in his Affidavit, that he was asked by the deceased Defendant No. 2 to help Defendant No. 3 -- Mrs. Manpreet Sharma, and to enter the name of Defendant No.3 in the records in respect of the subject property.

4. The Advocates for all the Defendants have now informed the Court that they have no objection if the Suit is decreed in favour of the Plaintiff and Defendant Nos. 4 and 5. In view thereof, the Suit is decreed in terms of prayer clauses (a) to (f). The Court Receiver is discharged without passing accounts, but upon payment of his costs, charges and expenses. The issue of costs to be paid by Defendant Nos. 1 to 4 are kept open. Notice of Motion No. 1168 of 2013 also stands disposed off. Miscellaneous Petition No. 90 of 2013 in Testamentary Petition No. 820 of 2012 is also made absolute in terms of prayer clause (a) therein, and the Letter of Administration dated 10th July, 2012, granted in favour of the Defendant No. 3 in Testamentary Petition No. 820 of 2012, is hereby revoked. The Defendant Nos. 1, 2(a) to 2 (d) or the Defendant No. 3, whosoever is in possession of the original Letter of Administration dated 10th July, 2012 is directed to forthwith deposit the original copy of the same with the Office of the Prothonotary and Senior Master, High Court, Bombay, for cancellation. Miscellaneous Petition No. 90 of 2013 is therefore disposed off.

5. However, in view of the above facts and circumstances, the matter cannot be closed by just passing a decree. It is not only a clear case of an attempt of land grabbing but a case where a fraud has been perpetrated on this Court by production of false death certificates of Smt. Kanta Kochhar and Wishwanath

Kochhar and obtaining Letters of Administration from this Court by perpetrating such fraud. From the Affidavits of Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 it appears that since Defendant No. 2 is no more, the entire blame is sought to be placed at the door of the deceased Defendant No.2. The explanation given by the Defendant No. 1 and the heirs of the deceased Defendant No. 2 is also not convincing/satisfactory. Defendant No. 1 is a builder. Defendant No. 2 was also involved in building/construction activities. In the Deed of Conveyance, consideration of Rs. 11,05,00,000/- is shown towards purchase of the Suit Property from Mrs. Manpreet Sharma. However, Mrs. Sharma states that she has received only Rs. 3.5 lacs. In any event, no builder worth his salt would pay such a huge amount without investigating the title and only relying upon certain 7/12 Extracts. The Plaintiff has pointed out that Defendant No. 1 was earlier arrested in a land grabbing case, and has also produced before this Court certain newspaper cuttings. Defendant No. 1 has informed the Court that after he was released from jail, the Complainant too was arrested by the police, who in fact was indulging in land grabbing cases. Be that as it may, I am satisfied that in the instant case none of the Defendants have chosen to own up their guilt. They have instead chosen the easier route of giving up their case of being owners of the Suit

Property and instead conveniently prayed for passing of a decree as prayed for in favour of the Plaintiffs.

6. As already stated in one of my earlier orders, the Judiciary is one of the important pillars of democracy. If an individual is allowed to perpetrate a fraud on the Courts/Judiciary, the entire judicial system runs the risk of being eroded and ultimately destroyed, which can never be permitted and has to be dealt with an iron hand. It is noted with distress by this Court that such frauds are largely perpetrated for monetary benefits accruing to the persons committing such violations. The present case appears to be one such case. The truth therefore needs to be investigated and ascertained. Therefore, before reaching any final conclusion qua the fraud that appears to have been committed, and looking at the gravity of the above facts, the Commissioner of Police, Greater Mumbai, is directed to appoint any Deputy Commissioner of Police to examine this case in the light of the facts set out in this Order and ascertain whether a prima facie case of commission of offence is made out. If the Officer so nominated comes to the conclusion that a case of commission of an offence is made out, the criminal law shall be forthwith set in motion by registering a First Information Report. The DCP so appointed shall be rendered assistance by the Prothonotary and

Senior Master by giving him such papers of these proceedings as he may require for the purposes of his enquiry. The concerned DCP appointed for this purpose shall submit a Compliance Report to this Court in a sealed cover on 2nd May, 2016.

The Prothonotary and Senior Master shall forthwith forward a copy of this Order to the Commissioner of Police, Greater Mumbai, by hand delivery.

(S.J. KATHAWALLA, J.)