

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.4452 OF 2015

Sajjad Garibshaha Pathan alias Irani and Ors.] ... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra.] ... Respondent

Mr. Vaibhav Ugle h/f Mr. Rajesh Katore for Petitioners.

Mr. A. R. Patil, APP for State.

CORAM :- RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.

DATE :- JULY 08, 2016

P. C. :-

1. By this petition, the petitioners pray for clubbing 55 cases, with regard to those offences that these petitioners have allegedly committed, in 3 groups to be listed before 3 Magistrates. It is also pleaded that if the Court is not inclined to accept this petition, all the pending cases with regard to those 55 offences be expedited.

2. I have heard the learned Counsel for petitioners and the learned APP.

3. The communication by the Police Inspector of the Crime Branch, Unit IV, Pune City, addressed to the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Control Room, Pune City, dated 06/02/2016 indicates that these petitioners are likely to be involved in 156 crimes. The petitioners have placed on record a list of pending sessions cases

which are 55 in number and of which 45 offences are said to have been committed in the year 2015.

4. The learned Counsel for petitioners has strenuously submitted that the charges leveled upon the petitioners are quite similar. The petitioners are facing prosecution in several Courts in the said offences. If the pending cases are to be dealt with by the respective Courts, they will take a considerable time for deciding them. If all these cases are clubbed into 3 groups and can be dealt with by 3 Courts, it would be easier for the prosecution to conduct those cases and at the same time, the petitioners would benefit out of the speedy trials.

5. Having considered the submissions of the petitioners, I do not find that the request made on either of the counts can be entertained. These petitioners are said to have committed 45 crimes of chain snatching ('*Mangalsutra*') in just one year. The police report indicates that there are about 156 such cases pending and it is suspected that the petitioners could be involved in the same. In this backdrop, at the behest of the petitioners, I do not find this to be a fit case for granting any of the prayers put forth.

6. In the light of the above, this petition is dismissed.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)