

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 4273 OF 2025

Narayan Chango Patil

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Kuldeep Patil i/by Ms. Saili Dhuru, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. S.V. Gavand, APP for the Respondent/State.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, JJ.

DATE : 13th AUGUST, 2025

P.C. :-

1. We have heard the learned Advocate for the Petitioner and the learned APP. A compilation (26 Pages), which is tendered by the learned APP, is taken on record and marked as 'X' for identification.

2. Contentious issues are raised. Word against word seems to be the situation. The Petitioner claims that the Station House Officer ('SHO') is behaving like a recovery officer and coercing him to pay the money to the Complainant. The learned APP, on

instructions, has vehemently denied the same and relies on the compilation to indicate that there are several issues, which would speak for themselves. The Accused does not come to the Police Station and does not cooperate in the inquiry. Per-contra, the Accused/Petitioner contends that he has visited the Police Station and the picture is quite different than what is sought to be shown to the Court by the learned APP.

3. The issue can be cut short. Let the SHO follow the due procedure to summon the Accused for interrogation. The time frame within which such interrogation could be conducted from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The SHO is at liberty to preserve the CCTV Footage of the interrogation considering that the CCTV cameras are set up inside the Police Station or the office of the concerned SHO.

4. The Petitioner would render wholehearted cooperation and would respond to the notice for interrogation. We grant liberty to the Petitioner to tender his written say as regards the contents of the complaint. All contentions are kept open. If he does not remain present, the SHO would maintain the record in the station diary and the CCTV Footage of the time at which the Accused was supposed

to visit the Police Station and subject himself to interrogation,
would also be preserved.

5. In view of the above, this **Writ Petition is disposed off.**

(GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)