

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 3231 of 2019

63 Moons Technologies LimitedPetitioner
versus
The State of Maharashtra and anr.Respondents

Mr. A. H. Ponda along with Mr. Gunjan Mangla i/b. Mr. Bhavesh M. Thakur, advocate for the petitioner.
Mrs. Aruna S. Pai, APP for the State.
Mr. H. S. Venegaonkar, advocate for respondent No.2-CBI.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
SMT. BHARATI H. DANGRE, JJ.**

DATE : 7th AUGUST, 2019.

P. C. :

The petition is filed for following reliefs:

(a) *Issue appropriate writ, order or direction entrusting the investigation into the complaint made by the Petitioner dated 15th February, 2016 (Exhibit-A) as well as the material brought on record in the instant writ petition to the Central Bureau of Investigation ie. Respondent No.2.*

(b) *As a sequel to the prayer (a) supra, direct the CBI, Respondent No.2 to carry out an expeditious time bound investigation into the matter and bring the culprits to justice;*

(c) *Monitor such investigations as enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, inter alia, in "**Babu Bhai Jamna Das Patel v. State of Gujarat; (2009) 9 SCC 610.**"*

2. Mr. Venegaonkar, learned counsel for the CBI, on instructions of the officer concerned, who is present before the Court, makes a statement the complaint as referred in prayer clause (a) is already received by the CBI and verification of the same is being undertaken. He further submits that once this exercise is completed, the enquiry into the allegations in the complaint would be made and appropriate decision would be taken and communicated to the petitioner expeditiously keeping in mind the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P., (2014) 2 SCC 1.**

3. In the light of the above statement of Mr. Venegaonkar, learned counsel for the CBI, the grievance made in the petition, no more survives. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed off.

[SMT. BHARATI H. DANGRE, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]