

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 6214 OF 2025

Jitendra Punamchand Maru

.. Petitioner

Vs.

The Central Bureau of Investigation
& Ors.

.. Respondents

...

Mr. Rajendra Desai a/w Mr. Kunal Bhanage i/by Mr. Akshay Pawar,
Advocates for the Petitioner.

Mr. Amit Munde, SPP a/w Mr. Jai Vohra for Respondent No.1-CBI.

Mr. Anil C. Singh, Additional Solicitor General a/w Ms. Neha N. Patil,
AOR a/w Mr. Aditya Thakkar, Mr. Krishnakant Deshmukh, Adarsh
Vyas, Rama Gupta & Mr. Rajdatt Nagre for Respondent No.2-UoI.

Mr. S. V. Gavand, Additional Public Prosecutor for Respondent No.3-
State.

Mr. Harish Salve, Senior Advocate, through V.C., a/w Mr. Vikram
Nankani, Senior Advocate, Mr. Rubin Vakil, Mr. Ashwin Dave, Mr.
Rishit Badiani & Mr. Gaurav Gangal i/by A. S. Dayal & Associates,
Advocates for Respondent No.4.

...

**CORAM : SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR, CJ &
SUMAN SHYAM, J.**

DATE : 23rd MARCH 2026.

P.C. :

On 10th March 2026, we passed the following order:

“ Mr. Kunal Bhanage, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks an adjournment on the ground that the arguing counsel is not available today.

2. This is another petition filed by Jitendra Punamchand Maru, who simply states that he is a citizen of India and his right to set the criminal law in motion has been recognized by law. Except that, the petitioner does not say anything about him.

3. *Having regard to the fact that the petitioner has filed this writ petition without making any disclosure as per the Bombay High Court Rules, we hereby direct the petitioner to remain physically present in the Court on the next day.*

4. *Post this matter on 23rd March 2026 together with Criminal Writ Petition No.5542 of 2025.”*

2. The petitioner is present in the Court and states that previously he was engaged in the business of sale of plastics. But presently there is no business activity carried out by him. On a Court's query what is the source of information on the basis of which this writ petition has been filed, Mr.Rajendra Desai, the learned counsel for the petitioner, who is present in the Court, states that after the petitioner came to know about a decision rendered by the Eastern District Court of New York, he made an application for obtaining a true attested copy of the said judgment and the present writ petition has been filed.

3. Mr. Anil C. Singh, the learned Additional Solicitor General raises objection to the maintainability of the writ petition. The learned Additional Solicitor General refers to an order passed by the High Court of Delhi in Writ Petition (C) 812/2026 tilted “*Ravi Sharma, Advocate v. Union of India & Ors.*” and submits that a similar petition, though labelled as Public Interest Litigation, has been dismissed by the High Court of Delhi, a copy of which has been tendered in the Court.

4. Judgment is reserved.

[SUMAN SHYAM,J.]

[CHIEF JUSTICE]