IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.3573 OF 2026

Rambhia Pravin Damji HUF ...Petitioner
[Through its Karta
Pravin Damji Rambhia]

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Anr. ...Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.3574 OF 2026

Pravin Damji Rambhia ...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Anr. ...Respondents

Mr. Satyavrat Joshi a/w Indrayanee Pandit, for the Petitioner.

Ms. S. D. Shinde, APP, for the Respondent-State.

Mr. Jatin Karia a/w D. M. Galani, for Respondent No.2.

Coram: Madhav J. Jamdar, J.
Date: October 13, 2026

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Joshi, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioners and Mr. Jatin Karia, learned Counsel appearing for Respondent No.2.

2. In these Writ Petitions, the challenge is to the Order dated 26th May 2026 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, City Civil & Sessions Court, C.R. No.84, Mazgaon, Mumbai in Miscellaneous Application No.116 of 2026 along with Miscellaneous Application No.115 of 2026.

3. Mr. Joshi, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioners, submits that the aforesaid applications were filed under Section 391 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, seeking permission to lead 'additional evidence'. He submits that, in fact, a similar application was filed in a companion case and was rejected by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate. The said Order, passed in CC No.2350/SC/2022, was challenged by filing Criminal Application No.1819 of 2024, and a learned Single Judge by Order dated 14th January 2025 allowed the said application. He, therefore, submits that the Petitioners be granted the same relief.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Jatin Karia, learned Counsel appearing for Respondent No.2, submits that, in fact, after the said Order dated 14th January 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in Criminal Application No.1819 of 2024, a similar application was filed in the present proceedings and, by consent of the parties, the said application was allowed. He submits that the present application is filed for delaying the hearing of the case.

5. Perusal of the record shows that the handwriting expert i.e. DW-8 has already been examined by the present Petitioners.

6. Thus, there is substance in the contention raised that the present applications have been filed to delay the proceedings.

7. Accordingly, no interference with the impugned Order is

warranted under the extraordinary and discretionary writ jurisdiction of this Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India.

8. Accordingly, the Writ Petitions are dismissed.

[Madhav J. Jamdar, J.]