

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 2679 OF 2017

Sincy Aji ThomasPetitioner
versus
The Commissioner of Police for Greater Mumbai
and ors.Respondents

Ms. K. P. Reshma i/b. K. P. Ravi, advocate for the petitioner.
Mrs. Aruna S. Pai, APP for the State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
SARANG V. KOTWAL, JJ.**

DATE : 14th JULY, 2017.

P. C. :

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petition is filed for the following reliefs:

“(a) that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to direct the Respondent Nos.1 to 4 to provide the Petitioner details regarding the death of the Petitioner's husband Aji Thomas, like the exact locality from where the dead body was recovered, copies of photographs taken at the place of the accident, copy of the Panchanama, copy of the FIR, copies of the statements recorded by the Police in connection with the death of the Petitioner's husband and steps taken by the Police with respect to handling of the dead body.

(b) that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to order that the body of the Petitioner's husband presently lying in the mortuary of Sir J. J. Hospital be autopsied once again to find the exact cause of his death;

(c) that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to order for a fresh investigation into the circumstances regarding the accidental death of the petitioner's husband and transfer the said investigation to the Crime Branch of Mumbai Police."

3. The learned APP, at the outset, having taken instructions from the officer concerned viz. Mr. Vijay Sawant, Police Inspector, Malabar Hill Police Station, Mumbai, makes a statement that the papers of investigation in the subject ADR would be given to the petitioner during the course of the day. The statement is accepted.

4. In the light of the above statement, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner will collect the dead body of her husband from the mortuary of Sir J.J. Hospital for conducting last rites during the course of the day. The statement is accepted. The learned counsel for the petitioner also states that she is not pressing the relief claimed in prayer clause (c) at this stage.

6. In the light of the above, the petition does not survive for further consideration and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)

[RANJIT MORE, J.]