

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 13667 OF 2025

Uday Anant Tayshette

...Petitioner

Versus

Commissioner of Police, Mira Bhayander
Vasai Virar Commissionerate and ors.

...Respondents

SANTOSH
SUBHASH
KULKARNI

Digitally signed by
SANTOSH SUBHASH
KULKARNI
Date: 2025.10.18
14:03:39 +0530

Mr. Sumedh Modak, a/w Vivek Rane, i/b Kuldeep Jain, for the
Petitioner.

Ms. Savina Crasto, for the State.

CORAM: N. J. JAMADAR, J.
DATED: 17th OCTOBER, 2025

Order:-

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
2. The challenge in this petition is to an order dated 17th September, 2025, passed by the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Mira-Bhayander, thereby, suspending the entertainment license of the petitioner to operate an Orchestra in the subject premises under the provisions of Rule 238 and 239 of the Entertainment Rules, 1960.
3. Mr. Modak, the learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that, the impugned order is in teeth of the binding precedents of this Court. The petitioner has availed the statutory remedy by filing an appeal before the Appellate Authority. However, in the intervening period, the execution and operation of the impugned

order deserves to be stayed.

4. As the petitioner has availed the statutory remedy, it may be expedient in the interest of justice that the said appeal is decided as expeditiously as possible, and having regard to the nature of the challenge, it may be appropriate to stay the execution and operation of the impugned order till the appeal is decided by the Appellate Authority.

5. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

- (i) The petition stands partly allowed.
- (ii) The respondent no. 2 is requested to decide the appeal as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of four weeks from the appearance of the petitioner before the Appellate Authority.
- (iii) The petitioner shall appear before the Appellate Authority on 27th October 2025.
- (iv) In the meanwhile, the execution and operation of the impugned order shall remain stayed till the decision of the appeal by the respondent no. 2.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]