

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

LAXMI
SUBHASH
SONTAKKE

Digitally signed by
LAXMI SUBHASH
SONTAKKE
Date: 2025.08.11
15:24:14 +0530

WRIT PETITION NO. 4313 OF 2025

Deepak Kochhar

.. Petitioner

Versus

Serious Fraud Investigation Office & Ors.

.. Respondents

Mr. Amit Desai, Senior Advocate a/w Gopal Krishna Shenoy, Pooja Kothari, Tanvi M. i/b. Rashmikanth & Partners for the Petitioner.

Mrs. Rutuja Ambekar, APP for the Respondent-State.

Ms. Manisha Jagtap, a/w Harikishan, Senior Prosecutor & Yashashree Raut for Respondent No.1.

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

DATE: AUGUST 08, 2025

P. C.

1. The Petitioner has put forth prayers under paragraph 32, which read thus:-

“a) issue appropriate writ(s), order(s) and/or directions(s) whereby this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to:

(i) Direct Respondent No. 1 to issue the necessary circular to ensure that senior citizens like the Petitioner, are only summoned and questioned during working hours;

Laxmi

(ii) Direct Respondent No. 1 to not take any coercive steps against the Petitioner in connection with the investigation in the affairs of NRPL and the 4 other companies.

(b) That pending the hearing and final disposal of the present Petition, this Hon'ble Court be pleased to direct Respondent No. 1 to not question the Petitioner beyond working hours on 8th August 2025 or any subsequent day summoned thereafter;

(c) That pending the hearing and final disposal of the present Petition, this Hon'ble Court be pleased to direct Respondent No. 1 to not take any coercive action against the Petitioner;

(d) For such other and further interim /ad-interim reliefs as the nature and circumstances of the case may require.”

2. There is no dispute that the Serious Fraud Investigation Office at Chennai Corporate Bhavan has called upon the Petitioner to participate in the interrogation in terms of the impugned notice issued, during the office hours.

3. We suggested that considering that the Petitioner is a senior citizen and would be traveling from Mumbai to Chennai, he be preferably summoned at around 11.30 am and the interrogation should commence within one hour of his reaching only to facilitate comfort to the Petitioner considering his age. If the interrogation continues till 5.00 pm on the said date and Respondent No. 1 needs the Petitioner for further interrogation, he may be

directed to attend the office at 11.30 am on the next date or on the date as will be mutually agreed upon.

4. In so far as the other prayers set out are concerned, we are not entertaining the same.

5. We are informed that the Petitioner has sought an adjournment today before Respondent No.1 office. By consent of the parties, the next date for interrogation is scheduled on 13th August, 2025 at 11.30 am. If the Petitioner is required for interrogation even on the next date or any subsequent date, the same schedule shall be followed.

6. With the above directions, this Petition is disposed off.

7. Needless to state, in the event the Petitioner has any fresh cause of action, all contentions are kept open.

[GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]