Jose

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.69 OF 2025

Mr. Ameet Savant
47 years, Indian National,
R/o H.No. 1066, Alto Torda,
Near SBI Bank, Alto Porvorim,
Bardez, Goa. ... Petitioner.

Versus

1. The State of Goa
Through Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Bombay at Goa
Porvorim Goa.

2. The Economic Offences Cell, Panaji
Through its Police Inspector
Panaji Goa.

3. Shyamalee Roy
R/o Flat no. B-6, Landscape city
Chogum road, Porvorim Goa

4. Shelly Madden
R/o H.no. 67/54 G-2/E block 2
Paithana Salvador Do Mundo
Parra Goa 403510

5. Anita Elizabeth Matthew
R/o H.no 986 Aldo Torda
P.O. Alto Porvorim- Goa ... Respondents.

Mr. Gaurish Agni with Mr. Yash Naik, Mr. Madhav Cuncoliencar, Mr. Kishan Kavlekar, Ms. Ruchika Mishra and

Ms. Leandra Lorreia, Advocates for the Petitioner.

Mr. S.G. Bhobe, Public Prosecutor for the State.

Mr. Neelesh Takkekar with Ms. Tanvi Naik, Advocates for Respondent Nos.3, 4 and 5.

WITH
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.68 OF 2025

Mr. Ameet Savant
47 years, Indian National,
R/o H.No. 1066, Alto Torda,
Near SBI Bank, Alto Porvorim,
Bardez, Goa. ... Petitioner.

Versus

1. The State of Goa
Through Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Bombay at Goa
Porvorim Goa.

2. The Economic Offences Cell, Panaji
Through its Police Inspector
Panaji Goa.

3. Mrs. Zena De'Souza
R/o H.no. 1345 Lane 10
Behind central bank,
Housing board Colony
Alto Porvorim Goa

4. Mr. Aldrin De'Souza
R/o H.no. 1345 Lane 10
Behind central bank,
Housing board Colony
Alto Porvorim Goa

5. Ms. Altertina A. Mendes
R/o H.no. 110/1 Mendes Waddo
Nagoa Bardez Goa ... Respondents.

Mr. Gaurish Agni with Mr. Yash Naik, Mr. Madhav Cuncoliencar, Mr. Kishan Kavlekar, Ms. Ruchika Mishra and Ms. Leandra Lorreia, Advocates for the Petitioner.

Mr. Somnath Karpe, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

Mr. Neelesh Takkekar with Ms. Tanvi Naik, Advocates for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

WITH
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.70 OF 2025 (F)

Mr. Ameet Savant
47 years, Indian National,
R/o H.No. 1066, Alto Torda,
Near SBI Bank, Alto Porvorim,
Bardez, Goa. ... Petitioner.

Versus

1. The State of Goa
Through Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Bombay at Goa
Porvorim Goa.

2. The Economic Offences Cell, Panaji
Through its Police Inspector
Panaji Goa.

3. Carl pinto De Andrade
R/o H.no. G203, 204
Devashri Pinto ville
Behind SBI Varsha colony
Alto Porvorim- Goa 403501

4. Cynthia Pinto De Andrade
R/o H.no. G203, 204
Devashri Pinto ville
Behind SBI Varsha colony
Alto Porvorim- Goa 403501

5. Shreya Pinto De Andrade
R/o H.no. G203, 204
Devashri Pinto ville
Behind SBI Varsha colony
Alto Porvorim- Goa 403501 ... Respondents.

Mr. Gaurish Agni with Mr. Yash Naik, Mr. Madhav Cuncoliencar, Mr. Kishan Kavlekar, Ms. Ruchika Mishra and Ms. Leandra Lorreia, Advocates for the Petitioner.

Mr. Somnath Karpe, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

Mr. Kiran Pai, Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 and 5.

CORAM: VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

DATED: 30th September, 2025

ORAL JUDGMENT:

1. Registry to waive office objections and register the matter.

2. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. With the consent of the parties, all three petitions are disposed of finally.

3. This is a common order disposing of three Criminal Writ Petitions Nos. 69/2025, 68/2025 and 70/2025, all against similar impugned orders dated 08.08.2025 passed by the Sessions Judge, North Goa at Panaji.

4. WPCR No. 69/2025 pertains to Special Criminal Case No.2/2025, WPCR No. 68/2025 to Special Criminal Case No. 5/2025 and WPCR No. 70/2025 to Special Criminal Case No. 6/2025. The impugned orders reject an application dated 16.07.2025 filed in all three cases, seek an order from the Sessions Court dealing with the aforementioned three cases, and with certain other cases which are connected with similar transactions where the Accused in all these cases is the Petitioner; the application seeks a direction/order to hold and declare that these three proceedings are not maintainable in view of the bifurcation of the charge-sheet arising out of the same transaction. These applications were rejected by the Sessions Court holding that bifurcated charge-sheets arise from one original FIR, and one original charge-sheet filed (Crime No.9/2019 dated 21.08.2019).

5. The entire transaction in this petition relates back to an FIR dated 21.08.2019 registered at the behest of a complaint made by six depositors, which was registered as Crime No.9/2019 by the Economic Offences Cell of the Goa Police. In this case, the main Complainant is one Rohit Chopra. This FIR, on investigation, culminated in the filing of a charge-sheet/final report before the Sessions Court bearing Special Case No.13/2019 (Charge-sheet No.1). Immediately thereafter, 35 more depositors alleged a similar crime which was registered as Crime No.11/2019 on 12.12.2019 before the Economic Offences Cell which culminated in filing of a Final Report which was registered by the Sessions Court as Special Case No.6/2022 (Charge-sheet No.2). During the course of hearing of these matters, on the oral directions of the Sessions Court, which are recorded in the Roznama, the Investigating Officer bifurcated Charge-sheet No.2 (Special Case No.6/2022) into three more charge-sheets and the same came to be registered by the Sessions Court as SPCC No.2/2025 (Charge-sheet No.3), SPCC No.5/2025 (Charge-sheet No.4) and SPCC No.6/2025 (Charge-sheet No.5). In all, therefore, there are five charge-sheets pending before the Special Court, which are actually offshoots of Charge-sheet No.1 under Special Case No.13/2019. In all these cases, there are four Accused (the Petitioners herein), of which Accused No.4 is a Company. In all these charge-sheets, the Accused have been charged for committing offences under Section 406, 409, 468, 420 r/w Section 34 IPC and Sections 3 and 5 of the Goa Protection of Interests of Depositors (in Financial Establishments) Act, 1999.

6. For easy reference, the details of various charge-sheets now pending before the Sessions Court/Special Court, under the Goa Protection of Interests of Depositors (in Financial Establishments) Act, 1999, at Merces are tabulated below:

LIST OF CASES AND DETAILS

Sr No	Case no.	FIR no.	Date	District Court	OFFENCES	ACCUSED	No. of Complaints
1	SPCC/13/2019	09/2019	21/08/2019	1-Principal District Judge And Sessions Judge - North Goa	IPC 406, 409, 468,420 & GPID 3,5	1. Ameet Savant 2. D P Singh 3. Hemant Majetia	6
2	SPCC/6/2022	11/2019	12/12/2019	1-Principal District Judge And Sessions Judge - North Goa	IPC 406, 409, 468,420 R/W 120 B & GPID 3,5	1.Ameet Savant 2. Jeevendra Poddar 3. Shipra Singh 4. Crefin India Management Pvt Ltd	35
3	SPCC/2/2025	11/2019	12/12/2019	1-Principal District Judge And Sessions Judge - North Goa	IPC 406, 409, 468,420 R/W 120 B & GPID 3,5	1.Ameet Savant 2. Jeevendra Poddar 3. Shipra Singh 4. Crefin India Management Pvt Ltd	3
4	SPCC/5/2025	11/2019	12/12/2019	1-Principal	IPC 406,	1.Ameet	

				District Judge And Sessions Judge - North Goa	409, 468,420 R/W 120 B & GPID 3,5	Savant 2. Jeevendra Poddar 3. Shipra Singh 4. Crefin India Management Pvt Ltd	
5	SPCC/6/2025	11/2019	12/12/2019	1-Principal District Judge And Sessions Judge - North Goa	IPC 406, 409, 468,420 R/W 120 B & GPID 3,5	1.Ameet Savant 2. Jeevendra Poddar 3. Shipra Singh 4. Crefin India Management Pvt Ltd	3
6	PMLA/5/2023	FIR no 09/2019	21/08/2019	1-Principal District Judge And Sessions Judge - North Goa	PMLA Act 45,3,4	1.Ameet Savant 2. Jeevendra Poddar 3. Shipra Singh 4. Crefin India Management Pvt Ltd	41

		& FIRno 11/2019	12/12/2010				

7. The main contention raised by the Petitioner in these three petitions is that, considering the provisions of Section 220 of the Cr.P.C., there was no question of bifurcation of the charge-sheets when the accusation in the original charge-sheet, i.e. Charge-sheet No.1, was of offences under Section 406, 409, 468, 420 r/w Section 34 IPC and Sections 3 and 5 of the Goa Protection of Interests of Depositors (in Financial Establishments) Act, 1999; that though these arise from multiple transactions of different investors, they relate to the same offences. It has been contended by learned Advocate Mr. Agni for the Petitioners that in cases, especially where multiple charge-sheets or FIRs are filed, where multiple investment transactions are made under State legislations dealing with Goa Protection of Interests of Depositors (in Financial Establishments) Act, 1999, the Supreme Court has consistently opined that the first charge-sheet is to be treated as the main charge-sheet, to be dealt by the Special Court, and all subsequent charge-sheets or complaints made are either to be treated as FIRs or supplementary charge-sheets, as the case may be, which are to be tagged or clubbed along with the first charge-sheet.

8. It was further submitted that based upon the case law rendered by the Supreme Court, the Special Court was obliged to try all the charge-sheets together through one trial, where witnesses across the original charge-sheet and the supplementary charge-sheets are to be examined in a single trial. Reference is made specifically to the following case law:

a) ***Abhishek Singh Chauhan v. Union of India and Others***, **2022 SCC OnLine SC 1936.**

b) ***Radhey Shyam v. State of Haryana and Ors.***, **2022 SCC OnLine SC 1935**.

c) ***Ravinder Singh Sidhu v. State of Punjab and Ors.***, **2025 SCC OnLine SC 1164.**

d) ***Satinder Singh Bhasin v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr.***, **(2023) 14 SCC 805.**

9. The learned Advocate appearing respectively for Respondent for Respondent Nos. 3 and 5 and Mr. S.G. Bhobe appearing for Respondent Nos.1 and 2 State, support this contention, since the case law submitted is directly on the point and supports the Petitioners submissions.

10. It would be relevant, for the decision of these petitions, to refer to the afore-stated case law.

In ***Abhishek Singh Chauhan v. Union of India and Others***, **2022 SCC OnLine SC 1936**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was considering multiple cases against the same Accused across various States, where they were charged of similar offences, and considered the course to be followed on such facts, and has held as under:

> "*4. The cases in the concerned States, to be tried by the Special Court can be conveniently clubbed, for being tried together as has been directed in the case of Radhey Shyam v. State of Haryana in Writ Petition (Crl.) No. 75/2020 vide Order dated 12.05.2022*
>
> *5. Following the exposition of this Court in Amish Devgan v. Union of India, we deem it appropriate in exercise of power under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, to direct clubbing of all the FIRs State-wise, which can proceed together for one trial as far as possible, as we are of the opinion that multiplicity of the proceedings will not be in the larger public interest. We may hasten to add that the concerned States have no abjection for abiding with such dispensation.*
>
> *6. In other words, the offence registered in the State of West Bengal being RC/40/5/2014 dated 05.06.2015 registered with CBI/SCB/SIT, Kolkata, will proceed before the concerned Court in the State of West Bengal independently. Similarly, the FIR registered at Pindwara, Sirohi, State of Rajasthan being FIR No. 338/2018 dated 12.09.2018 shall proceed before the concerned jurisdictional Court in that State itself being the only case registered in connection with the Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) offences in that State and cannot be clubbed with the cases pending in other States, as the same will have to proceed under the special enactments of the concerned State.*
>
> *10 In each of the States, where directions for clubbing of FIRs is being passed, the subsequently registered FIRs shall be treated as statements under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr.P.C.) The Investigating officer in criminal case arising from*

the first FIR in the concerned State, as referred to above, will be free to file supplementary chargesheet after collation of all the records concerning other FIRs in the respective States, which are clubbed in terms of this order (In the event, the investigating officer in other FIRs had already filed the police report under Section 173 of the Cr. P.C. before the concerned Court and the concerned Court had taken cognizance thereof, the said FIRS and criminal cases would also stand transferred and merged/clubbed alongwith the first criminal case registered in the respective State, as referred to above, to be proceeded with in accordance with law. The investigating officer in the stated case which the subsequent FIRS would stand (principal case to merged/clubbed), will be free to file supplementary chargesheet on thebasis of material collated during investigation of other FIR's.

11. Needless to observe that the other offences not part of the special enactments can also be tried by the special Court under the concerned State legislation.

12. It is clarified that this direction is limited to general offences, the offences under the IPC and the offences under the special State legislations, and not offences concerning the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), 2002, which have to proceed under a separate legislation and of which the investigation is done by a separate investigating agency

(13) In other words, all cases in the State of Maharashtra will stand clubbed with FIR No. 552/2016 dated 15.04.2016, registered with Police Station Ramnagar, Chandrapur, and to be tried by Special Court at Chandrapur (Maharashtra). Similarly, all criminal cases arising from the FIRs filed at the different point of time in the State of Madhya Pradesh will stand clubbed with FIR No 915/2016 dated 09.11.2016, registered with Police Station Kotwali, Sehore- to be tried by Special Court, Sehore (Madhya Pradesh); and in the State of Chhattisgarh on the same lines will stand clubbed with FIR No. 146/2017 dated to be tried by 04.04.2017 registered with Police Station Surajpur-

to be tried by Special Court at Surajpur (Chhattisgarh)

14. If the accused has been granted bail in connection with the prinefpal FIR or criminal case arising therefrom, in which the other FIRs/criminal cases will stand clubbed/merged in terms of this order, the bail so granted must enure in his favour until the Court of competent jurisdiction cancels the same owing to supervening circumstances including breach of bail conditions. In case, no bail has been granted in the principal FIR (case), the appellant may apply for the same before the jurisdictional court competent to try the principal crime. That be decided on its own merits."

In ***Ravinder Singh Sidhu v. State of Punjab and Ors.***, **2025 SCC OnLine SC 1164**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered a similar situation, where Accused across many States were charged, both under provisions of the IPC and under State enactments for the protection of the interest of depositors, and held as under:

"*10. Heard learned Senior Counsel/Counsel for the parties. The law in this issue is now fairly well settled. It has been held by this Court that multiplicity of proceedings will not be in larger public interest, Further, since many States have invoked local Acts, particularly the Act dealing with the Protection of Interest of Depositors, transferring them out of the State also will not serve the ends of justice. Hence, the correct course of action would be to merge the FIR's with the earliest FIR in the State concerned. It is clarified that if the first FIR in the respective 1 States of Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand is registered in respect of offence under the general law and not the special enactment, but if the S subsequent FIR's now clubbed are registered in connection with the special law or registered also in connection with the special law, the same after clubbing must be* *tried under the special law by the Special Court(s) [See Radhey Shyam v. State of Haryana, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1935 and Abhishek Singh Chauhan v. Union of India, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1936].*

19. The writ petition stands allowed in the above terms. We further direct while the first FIR will be treated as the First Information Report (hereinafter for convenience called the 'principal FIR'), the subsequent FIR's in each State shall be treated as Statements under Section 161 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) The Investigating Officer in the criminal case arising out of the principal FIR in the concerned State will be free to file supplementary charge-sheets after the collation of all records concerning other FIR's in the concerned State which are clubbed in terms of this order. We further direct that if Police Report under Section 173 of CrPC stands already filed in the clubbed FIRs and the concerned Courts have taken cognizance thereof, the said FIRs and criminal cases would also stand transferred and merged/clubbed along with the principal FIR to be proceeded with in accordance with law.

20. The investigating officer in the principal proceedings will be free to file supplementary charge-sheet on the basis of the material collated during investigation of other FIR's. We also make it cleart that the other offences not part of the special enactments can also be tried by the Special Court under the concerned State legislation. We also further direct that in case the petitioner has been granted bail in connection with the principal proceeding/criminal case to which the other cases have been clubbed, the bail so granted must enure to the petitioner's favour in the other Fir's now clubbed as well. We further clarify that if the principal FIR is limited to offence under the general law/Penal Code but the subsequent FIRs contain allegations attracting offences under granted is only for some offences under the general law, the Special Court is entitled to insist for a fresh bail application to be filed by the petitioner in relation to those offences including under the Special Act The said bail

> *application(s) shall be decided on its own merits in accordance with law.*"

In ***Satinder Singh Bhasin v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr.***, **(2023) 14 SCC 805**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered, in such cases, what is the course to be followed in conducting a single trial, and held as under:

> "*15. Further, it will be open to the investigating officer in the case registered as PIR No. 206/2019, to file a supplementary charge-sheet which will be composite charge-sheet to deal with all the statements collated during the investigation in the other cases, including the statement of complainant in the respective FIR as being statement under Section 161 CrPC. The supplementary charge-sheet to be filed on the basis of the entire record so collected during the investigation in the respective cases will be then made the basis to proceed for trial against the petitioner(s) and named accused therein*
>
> *16. Furthermore, the trial shall proceed as per law from the stage of filing of the supplementary charge-sheet. In case the courts have already taken cognizance on the basis of charge-sheet(s) filed in respective cases, those cases in terms of this order shall stand transferred and merged with the trial of the case arising from FIR No. 206/2019.*
>
> *26. Accordingly, following the principle enunciated by this Court in Amish a Devgan v. Union of India, as also in the peculiar facts of the present case, we, in exercise of power under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, accede to the relief claimed in terms of the Prayer clause (b) of consolidation of all FIRs, including registered in New Delhi with FIR No. 353/2015 as the principal FIR and for being proceeded with in accordance with law, as we are of the opinion that multiplicity of the proceedings will not be in the larger public interest as well*

27. It is brought to our notice that investigation in respect of some FIRS has been completed and even charge-sheet(s) have been filed by the Special Investigation Team (SIT), constituted by the State of Uttar Pradesh in respect of all these cases. In terms of this order, the charge-sheet(s) filed in other cases shall stand merged with the charge-sheet filed in criminal case arising out of FIR No.353/2015.

28. Further, it will be open to the investigating officer in the case registered as No. 353/2015, to fife a supplementary charge-sheet, which will be a composite charge-sheet to deal with all the statements collated during the investigation in the other cases, including the statement of the complainant in the respective FIR as being statement under Section 161 CrPC. The supplementary charge-sheet to be filed on the basis of the entire record so collected during the investigation in the respective cases will be then made the basis to proceed for trial against the petitioner and named accused therein.

29. Furthermore, the trial shall proceed as per law from the stage of filing of the supplementary charge-sheet In case, the courts have already taken cognizance on the basis of the charge-sheet(s) filed in respective cases, those cases in terms of this order shall stand transferred and merged with the trial of e the case arising from FIR No. 353/2015."

11. The upshot of the discussion in the aforementioned Judgments would be that the provisions of Section 220 and more specifically Sub-Sections 1 and 2 thereof would specifically apply to cases covered by Charge-sheet Nos.1 to 5 referred above; this is more so because in all these charge-sheets, the offence alleged is exactly the same, against a common set of Accused whose details are found in paragraph 6 above. For some unknown reason, the Sessions Court has chosen, at one point of time, to bifurcate Charge-sheet No.2 into three more charge-sheets ending up with five charge-sheets before it, and has held in the impugned order, perhaps attempting to record five separate trials, which is diametrically opposed to what is held in *Abhishek Singh Chauhan* (supra), *Radhey Shyam* (supra), *Ravinder Singh Sidhu* (supra) and *Satinder Singh Bhasin* (supra) by the Supreme Court.

12. Further, from the record, it now transpires that the Economic Offences Cell has now filed a complaint under Section 3, 4 and 45 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (PMLA) against the very same Accused, and this case is also pending and registered as Special Case PMLA No.5/2023 before the very same Sessions Court. Obviously, the trial in the PMLA case would be taken separately from the trial in the five charge-sheets. The PMLA case is based on the predicate offence, which is found in Charge-sheet Nos. 1 to 5 which were filed prior in point of time.

13. Applying the principle laid down by the Supreme Court where trials are to be conducted in cases where multiple charge-sheets are filed on similar transactions, and considering the fact that out of the five charge-sheets and the PMLA case filed, the Accused are all the same, it would be appropriate, that in all such cases, the first charge-sheet shall be treated as the principle charge-sheet and all subsequent charge-sheets shall be treated as supplementary charge-sheets to the first charge-sheet. All these charge-sheets would necessarily have to be tried under one trial at which witnesses arraigned in each of the supplementary charge-sheets and the witnesses in the main charge-sheet are to be examined, in one single trial. In the present case, Charge-sheet No.1 (Special Case No.13/2019) shall be treated as the principle charge-sheet, whilst Charge-sheet Nos. 2 to 5, which are Special Case No.6/2022, Special Case No.2/2025, Special Case No.5/2025 and Special Case No.6/2025, shall be treated as supplementary charge-sheets to Charge-sheet No.1 in Special Case No.13/2019. The Sessions Court shall try all five charge-sheets under one trial at which witnesses arraigned in all five charge-sheets shall be examined in a single trial under Special Case No.13/2019. Considering that there are five registered cases to be tried together, the Director of Prosecution shall ensure that in all five cases, a single Public Prosecutor shall be assigned, who shall control the trial and submit a single trial program which is common to all five cases.

14. The PMLA case, being founded upon a predicate offence which is found in the aforementioned five charge-sheets, the trial in this case would be conducted as far as possible, immediately trailing the trial in Special Case No.13/2019.

15. Learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that the Accused would be arguing for discharge of the Accused. The hearing in this matter is in progress. The Sessions Court is requested to complete the arguments on whether charge is to be framed against the Accused, hear and pass orders, preferably by 30.11.2025. A single order shall be passed at this hearing and shall be considered to be an order in Special Case No.13/2019, though the Advocates assisting the Prosecution may be multiple, and though the Public Prosecutor may be heard in answer to the arguments led by the Accused in respect of all five cases.

16. It is made clear, that in the event the Sessions Court rejects the application for discharge of the Accused, and decides to frame charge, a single charge shall be framed, as being held in the aforementioned Judgments, though the cases have been registered as multiple cases.

17. The Principal District Judges of North and South Goa Districts are requested to circulate this Judgment to all Courts within their District so as to enable the Judicial Officers to follow the principles laid down by the Supreme Court in the Judgments referred above i.e. *Abhishek Singh Chauhan* (supra), *Radhey Shyam* (supra), *Ravinder Singh Sidhu* (supra) and *Satinder Singh Bhasin* (supra).

18. Similarly, this Judgment may be circulated to the Director of Prosecution for further circulation to all the Public Prosecutors and Additional/Assistant Public Prosecutors, who shall assist the respective Courts to which they are assigned in ensuring the principles laid down in *Abhishek Singh Chauhan* (supra), *Radhey Shyam* (supra), *Ravinder Singh Sidhu* (supra) and *Satinder Singh*

Bhasin (supra) are followed.

19. In the light of the above discussion, the impugned orders dated 08.08.2025 passed by the Sessions Court in WPCR Nos. 69/2025, 68/2025 and 70/2025 are quashed and set aside. The Session Court shall now follow the directions specifically laid down in paragraph 10 above and shall treat Special Case No.13/2019 (Charge-sheet No.1) as the principal case/charge-sheet and the five other charge-sheets under Special Case No.6/2022, 2/2025, 5/2025 and 6/2025, as supplementary charge-sheets, and shall hold a single trial in all these cases, in the manner detailed in the preceding paragraphs.

20. Rule is made absolute in the above terms. No costs.

VALMIKI MENEZES, J.