

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 5024 OF 2025

Akshay @ Archi Vinod Chaudhary

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors.

...Respondent

Mr. Amey Sheth, for the Petitioner.

Mr. P. P. Malshe, APP for State.

SANTOSH
SUBHASH
KULKARNI

Digitally signed by
SANTOSH SUBHASH
KULKARNI
Date: 2025.11.18
18:45:37 +0530

CORAM: N. J. JAMADAR, J.

DATED: 17th NOVEMBER, 2025

Oral Order:-

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner.
2. The petitioner has an efficacious remedy of preferring an appeal before the Divisional Commissioner under Section 60 of the Maharashtra Police Act, 1951.
3. I have perused the impugned order. None of the contingencies in which the writ court may exercise extraordinary writ jurisdiction despite availability of the efficacious alternate statutory remedy, as enunciated in the case of *Whirlpool Corporation vs. Registration of Trademarks*¹, is made out.

1 (1998) 8 SCC 1.

4. In the circumstances of the case, the Court is of the view that, the petitioner must exhaust the statutory remedy of appeal.

5. The petition, thus, stands disposed with liberty to the petitioner to avail the remedy of appeal before the Divisional Commissioner.

6. In the event such an appeal is filed within a period of two weeks, the Divisional Commissioner is requested to make an endeavour to hear and decide the said appeal as expeditiously as possible and, preferably, within a period of six weeks from the date of filing of the appeal.

7. The petition stands disposed.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]