

Santosh

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 80 OF 2022**

YATIN PAREKH.

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF GOA THR. PUBLIC
PROSECUTOR AND 2 ORS

... RESPONDENTS

Mr. Jonathan George, Advocate *for the Petitioner.*

Mr. S.G. Bhobe, Public Prosecutor *for the State-Respondents
No.1 & 2.*

Mr. T. Gawas, Advocate *for Respondent No.3.*

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE &
BHARAT P. DESHPANDE, JJ.**

DATED : 13 SEPTEMBER 2022

P.C.:-

1. The Petitioner is before this Court with a prayer whereby quashment of the First Information Report No. 137/2019 dated 31st May, 2019 registered at the Panaji Police Station, is sought for.

2. The report against the Petitioner is lodged on 31st May, 2019. The present Petition is filed in the year 2022. The reasons

for approaching this Court after 3 years are not disclosed in the Petition. However, orally the Counsel for the Petitioner submits that when the Petitioner was in a process to travel from India to a foreign country, he was stopped at the airport and was informed that an FIR is registered against him. On such information, the Petitioner has approached this Court. Now, though this is an oral statement before this Court, the statements in the Petition are reflecting an entirely different story.

3. In the Petition, at paragraph 5, the following statement is made and it reads “By way of order dated June 03, 2019, the Sessions Court, Panaji, Goa was pleased to allow the application and granted anticipatory bail to the petitioner.” It is further stated that the only conditions in such anticipatory bail order were that the Petitioner should attend the Panaji Police Station as and when called upon and cooperate with the investigation, and not to tamper with evidence or interfere with the prosecution witnesses.

4. Now, again, interestingly the Petitioner in paragraph 6 makes a further statement and submits before this Court that after a period of almost 2 years, the investigating agency filed a closure report dated October 04, 2021. Further, it is stated that

the application for closure of the said FIR has not been disposed of.

5. In view of all the above referred facts, we see absolutely no reason to entertain this Petition. It seems that the Petition is filed in this Court on some erroneous impression and misreading of the documents.

6. Considering all these facts, in our opinion, the Petition is devoid of any merits and deserves to be dismissed.

7. Accordingly, the Petition is dismissed.

BHARAT P. DESHPANDE, J.

PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.

SANTOSH S. MHAMAL
Digitally signed by
SANTOSH S. MHAMAL
Date: 2022.09.13
16:47:53 +05'30'