



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 903 OF 2025

[Sanjeev S/o Ramkumar Mishra **vs.** The State of Maharashtra,
through its Secretary, Home Department and anr.]

Office Notes, Office Memoranda
of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. P. D. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. K. R. Lule, A.P.P. for the State/respondent nos. 1 and 2

CORAM: ANIL L. PANSARE
AND RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.

DATE : 13-11-2025.

Heard.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that respondent no. 1 has passed order under Section 4 and 5 of the Maharashtra Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 1999 (for short 'MPID Act') attaching several properties, one of which is shown in the name of petitioner, though, he is not owner of the property.

3. Thus, it is not the grievance of the petitioner that property owned by him has been attached. In fact, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner's property has been not attached but his name is shown in the order. If that be so, the petitioner cannot be said to be aggrieved person. Admittedly, the petitioner's property has been not attached. The petitioner, therefore, may approach appropriate forum

2

for deletion of his name from revenue record. The petition is accordingly disposed of.

4. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the name of subsequent owner has been incorporated in the revenue record and despite such fact, petitioner's name has been mentioned in the order of attachment.

5. If that be so, we grant petitioner liberty to approach respondent no. 1 for modification of the order. The application/representation, if so made, shall be decided within 30 days from the date of receipt of such application/representation.

(JUDGE)

(JUDGE.)

wasnik