

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 348 OF 2017
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 596 OF 2015

M/s. Stationary Point India Ltd. and ors.	..Applicants/ Petitioners
Versus	
Supt. of Police, Central Bureau of Investigation, CBI, EOW, Mumbai and ors.	..Respondents

Mr. Samyak N. Gimekar, advocate for the applicants/petitioners.
Ms. Rebecca Gonsalvez, advocate for the respondent No.1.
Mr. V. B. Konde-Deshmukh, APP for the State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
PRAKASH D. NAIK, J J.**

DATE : 11th OCTOBER, 2017.

P. C. :

For the reasons stated in paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5, the criminal application is allowed in terms of prayer clauses (b) and (c) and is disposed off as such. The writ petition is restored to its original file.

(PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.)

[RANJIT MORE, J.]

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 596 OF 2015**

M/s. Stationary Point India Ltd. and ors.	.. Petitioners
Versus	
Supt. of Police, Central Bureau of Investigation, CBI, EOW, Mumbai and ors.	..Respondents

Mr. Samyak N. Gimekar, advocate for the petitioners.
Ms. Rebecca Gonsalvez, advocate for the respondent No.1.
Mr. V. B. Konde-Deshmukh, APP for the State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
PRAKASH D. NAIK, J J.**

DATE : 11th OCTOBER, 2017.

P. C. :

Heard Mr. Gimekar, learend counsel for the petitioners,
Ms. Gonsalvez, learned counsel for the respondent No.1 and Mr. V. B.
Konde-Deshmukh, learned APP for the State.

2. The petition is filed for quashment of FIR No. RC 8/E/2014 registered with CBI, EOW, Mumbai for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 467 and 471 read with Section 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

3. Ms. Gonsalvez, learned counsel for the petitioners, on instructions, makes a statement that during the pendency of the subject petition, the investigation into the subject FIR was completed and charge-sheet was filed before the concerned magistrate. Thereafter, charge came to be framed on 18th December, 2015. The petitioner challenged the said order by filing writ petition No.4139 of 2016 before a learned Single Judge of this Court. However, the petitioner withdrew the said petition and, accordingly, the learned Single Judge disposed off this petition.

4. In the light of the above, the present petition is not maintainable and the same is dismissed.

(PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.)

[RANJIT MORE, J.]