

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****WRIT PETITION NO.1376 OF 2024**

Vikram Ramesh Rughani,]
Age: 44 Years, Occupation: Commission Agent,]
Son of Ramesh Rughani,]
Residing at 106, Vrindavan Garden,]
Near Scheme 140, Indore]
Madhya Pradesh – 452 016.] ... Petitioner

V/s.

1. The State of Maharashtra]
Through the Secretary to the Government of]
Maharashtra in Home Department, Mantralaya]
Fort, Mumbai – 400 032.]

2. Bhushan Dayama, Police Inspector,]
Mulund Police Station, Mulund (West),]
Mumbai.]

3. Mukesh Gholup, Police Sub Inspector,]
Mulund Police Station, Mulund (West),]
Mumbai.]

4. Sachin Bansode, Police Constable,]
Mulund Police Station, Mulund (West),]
Mumbai.]

5. Dhanaji Kadam, Town Inspector,]
Mulund Police Station, Mulund (West),]
Mumbai.]

6. Ravindra Gurjar, Town Inspector,]
Vijay Nagar Police Station,]
Vijay Nagar, Indore, M.P.] ... Respondents

WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (STAMP) NO.5147 OF 2025

Vikram Ramesh Rughani (Deceased)] ... Petitioner

1. Suresh Nainmal Rughani,]
Age: 64 Years, Occupation: Social Worker,]
R/o. 106, Vrindavan Garden,]
Near Scheme 140, Indore]
Madhya Pradesh – 452 016.]

2. Ramesh Nainmal Rughani,]
Age: 72 Years, Occupation: Consultancy,]
R/13, Shanti Niketan, Keshav Nagar,]
Behind Khodaram Bagh]
Boiser – 401501, Maharashtra.]

3. Geeta Ramesh Rughani,]
Age: 69 Years, Occupation: Household,]
R/13, Shanti Niketan, Keshav Nagar,]
Behind Khodaram Bagh]
Boiser – 401501, Maharashtra.]

... Applicants

V/s.

1. The State of Maharashtra]
Through the Secretary to the Government of]
Maharashtra in Home Department, Mantralaya]
Fort, Mumbai – 400 032.]

2. Bhushan Dayama, Police Inspector,]
Mulund Police Station, Mulund (West),]
Mumbai.]

3. Mukesh Gholup, Police Sub Inspector,]
Mulund Police Station, Mulund (West),]
Mumbai.]

4. Sachin Bansode, Police Constable,]
Mulund Police Station, Mulund (West),]
Mumbai.]

5. Dhanaji Kadam, Town Inspector,]
Mulund Police Station, Mulund (West),]
Mumbai.]

6. Ravindra Gurjar, Town Inspector,]
Vijay Nagar Police Station,]
Vijay Nagar, Indore, M.P.] ... Respondents

Mr. Suresh N. Rughani, party in person.
Mr. Vinod Chate, APP, for the Respondent-State.

**CORAM : A. S. GADKARI AND
KAMAL KHATA, JJ.**

DATE : 6th March 2026

P.C.:-

1) The present Petition stood disposed off as abated upon the demise of the Petitioner on 22nd December 2024. The Petition was filed by Mr. Vikram Ramesh Rughani seeking the following reliefs:

“(b) That this Court be pleased to issue appropriate Writ or order or direction to the Respondents for payment of the compensation of Rs.5 lacs to the petitioner for his illegal arrest and detention.

(c) That the Respondent Nos.2 to 6 be suitably punished for the illegal arrest and detention and for contempt of the Court.

(d) That this Court be pleased to pass order and direction pending the hearing and final disposal of this petition, no further coercive steps to be taken against the Petitioner.”

2) The present Interim Application has been preferred by the Applicant-Suresh Raghani and others claiming to be legal heirs of the deceased Petitioner, seeking permission to pursue the Petition. Mr. Suresh Raghani appears in-person pursuant to the permission granted by the Committee constituted under Chapter IV-A, titled '*Norms for Presentation and Conduct of Proceedings in Person by Parties*' under the Bombay High Court Appellate Side Rules, 1960.

3) The Petition alleging illegal detention pertains to C.R. No.779 of 2021 registered with Mulund Police Station, Mumbai. The record further indicates that, the Applicant No.1, Mr. Suresh Raghani, had also filed Writ Petition (ST) No.4289 of 2025 seeking similar reliefs in respect of the very same crime i.e. 779 of 2021. The said Petition has already been dismissed by a detailed Judgment dated 7th August 2024 by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court.

4) In this background, the present Application has been filed seeking to implead the Applicants as legal heirs in order to pursue the Petition on behalf of the deceased Vikram Raghani.

5) At the outset, we may note it that, the Applicant Suresh Raghani cannot represent the Applicant Nos. 2 and 3, namely Ramesh and Geeta, even if he claims to be their Constituted Attorney.

6) According to us, neither Section 30 nor Section 32 of the

Advocates Act, permit such representation. In any event, as the Petition has already abated on account of the demise of the Petitioner, there arises no question of permitting the Suresh Rughani to pursue the same.

6.1) Apart from the above, it is also pertinent that the substantive Petition filed by Suresh Rughani in respect of the same cause of action has already been dismissed by the Co-ordinate Bench.

7) In view of the above, we find that the present Interim Application is misconceived and is accordingly dismissed.

8) Thus, the Petition stands disposed as abated and the Interim Application is disposed off for the aforesaid reasons.

(KAMAL KHATA, J.)

(A.S. GADKARI, J.)