

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.89 OF 2026

Santosh Sopan Sawant

.. Petitioner

Vs.

State of Maharashtra & Ors.

.. Respondents

...

Mr. Mahesh Rajpopat a/w. Mr. Akshit Kothari,
Advocates for the Petitioner

Mr. J. P. Yagnik, Additional Public Prosecutor for the
Respondent Nos.1 to 3-State

**CORAM : SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR, CJ &
GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.**

DATE : 9th FEBRUARY 2026

P.C. :

The first prayer in this writ petition is for a direction to the respondent no.2 to register a First Information Report on the basis of the complaint given by the petitioner on 24th July 2023 alleging commission of the offences under sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code and to conduct a fair, proper and impartial investigation. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there are other prayers made by the petitioner for a direction to the respondent nos.4 and 5 for initiating an inquiry into the matter.

2. In our opinion, on the allegations that the accused persons, namely, Omprakash Chunnilal Bahal @ Omee Bahl, Meena Bahal and other persons committed forgery and got the name of Mrs. Priyanka Dilip Nagrani @ Priyanka Parul Nagrani entered into the Slum Rehabilitation Authority records and seeking a direction to register the First Information Report, the petitioner cannot maintain

this writ petition for a direction to the respondent nos.4 and 5 to initiate an inquiry in the matter. The proceedings before the respondent nos.4 and 5 are not brought on record. The petitioner himself states in the complaint at paragraph no.10 that he has been chasing Md. Amjad Ahmed Shaikh and Mr.Omprakash Chunnilal Bahal @ Omee Bahl for the last ten years in relation to the agreement demanding rent and transfer of said premises in his name. If at all it is accepted that Mr. Omprakash Chunilal Bahal @ Omee Bahl and others gave false assurances to the petitioner, the respondent nos.4 and 5 may not have jurisdiction to adjudicate said case. We are conscious that the observations made by this Court in this order may prejudice to the petitioner in the other proceedings which he has initiated or intends to initiate and we would simply dismiss this writ petition observing that no indulgence can be granted in this matter.

3. Writ Petition No.89 of 2026 is dismissed accordingly.

[GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.]

[CHIEF JUSTICE]