

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION No. 5117 OF 2017

Rajesh Buddalal Mehta

...Petitioner

Vs.

Competent Authority and Anr.

...Respondent

Mr Pravin U. Gaikwad for Petitioner

Mr. Y.Y. Dabke -APP for the State.

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.

DATE: MARCH 1, 2018

P.C.

1. The Petitioner has challenged the order dated October 12, 2017 passed by the Special Judge, City Civil & Sessions Court, Greater Bombay in MPID Case No. 1 of 2014. It is the case of the Petitioner that once the property which is order to be sold in the aforesaid offence, there hardly remained anything to the Petitioner for his maintenance. In support of his submissions, he relied on the provisions of the MPID Act and more particularly, section 10 of the said Act so as to substantiate his contention.

2. The proceedings for the attachment of the property and sale of the property were going on since 2013. The Petitioner has neither challenged the

attachment order nor consequential order passed, which are referred to in the impugned order.

3. There is hardly explanation for not challenging such order. In that view of the matter, this Court do not see any reason to interfere with the impugned order by inheriting its extra ordinary jurisdiction. Hence, on that merits, writ petition is dismissed.

[NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.]