

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 6355 OF 2025

Syed Tasneem Begum D/o Niyamatulla
alias Mrs. Tasneem Peerpasha Huseni Inamdar ..Petitioner

Versus

Mrs. Abeda Inamdar & Ors. ..Respondents

Mr. Zaid A. Qureshi for the Petitioner.
Mr. Ravi Kadam, Sr. Advocate i/b. S.S.Bedekar for Respondent No.1.
Dr. Abhinav Chandrachud i/b. S.S.Bedekar for Respondent No.2.
Mr. Pralhad Paranjape a/w. Rahul Punjabi and Ishan Shroff i/b. Rahul Punjabi for Respondent No.3.
Ms. Manjiri Parasnis for the Respondent No.5.
Mr. Ashish Satpute, APP for State/Respondent No.9.

**CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL &
SANDESH D. PATIL, JJ.**

DATE : 1 APRIL 2026

PC :

1. This is a petition for direction in the nature of writ of *habeas corpus* for producing the Petitioner No.2 before this Court and for declaration that his continuing restrain and house detention by the Respondent Nos.1 to 8 and their associates is illegal. This is one of the main prayers. There are many other

prayers in the petition, but all those prayers revolve around the main relief of issuing some direction to hold that his restraint is illegal. One of the prayers is for direction for registration of F.I.R.. But, as mentioned, all other prayers which are very wide depend on whether he is in illegal detention.

2. Heard Mr. Zaid Qureshi, learned counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. Ravi Kadam, learned Senior counsel for the Respondent No.1, Dr. Abhinav Chandrachud, learned counsel for the Respondent No.2, Mr. Pralhad Paranjape, learned counsel for the Respondent No.3, Ms. Manjiri Parasnis, learned counsel for the Respondent No.5 and Mr. Ashish Satpute, learned APP for the State-Respondent No.9.

3. Vide the order dated 13.03.2026 we had considered the submissions made by the contesting parties. There was strong opposition from the Respondent Nos.1 and 2, even for entertaining this petition. But we had referred to a communication which is at Exhibit-J and, therefore, we wanted a report about the safety of the Petitioner No.2. With that view, we had directed the police

officer attached to Samarth Nagar police station in Nana Peth, Pune, to visit the house of the Respondent No.1 and to see the medical condition of the Petitioner No.2. The police officers were also directed to collect the medical papers from the Doctors who were treating the Petitioner No.2, and to submit a report before this Court. Accordingly, the learned APP has produced a report before us.

4. Learned Senior counsel appearing for the Respondent No.1 submitted that, to maintain privacy of the medical condition of the Petitioner No.2, the report may not be made public and a copy may not be given to the Petitioner No.1.

5. We have perused the report. Since it is important, we direct the Registry to keep this report in a sealed envelope with the record of this petition. Though, the privacy, as far as the medical condition of the Petitioner No.2 is concerned, can be maintained; however, for passing the order it is necessary to refer to certain statements made in the report to decide this petition.

6. The medical certificate is issued by the Doctor attached

to the Deenanath Mangeshkar Hospital and Research Center. The medical papers and the treatment papers are annexed to the report. The medical certificate indicates that, considering the age and medical condition, it would not be proper to ask the Petitioner No.2 to travel from Pune to Mumbai and to remain present before the Court for satisfying ourselves about his wish. Therefore, in this situation, we are relying on the report of the police officers. The report mentions that the concerned police officers attached to Samarth Nagar police station in Nana Peth, Pune had personally visited the house of the Respondent No.1 and they had interviewed the Petitioner No.2. The Police Officers have verified the medical condition of the Petitioner No.2 with the Medical Officer treating the Petitioner No.2. From the report it is clear that the Petitioner No.2 is safe and he is being treated by the Doctor attached to a reputed medical institution.

7. In this view of the matter, it cannot be said that the Petitioner No.2 is in illegal detention. Therefore, we do not see any reason to issue any direction in the nature of writ of *habeas corpus*. As mentioned earlier, all other prayers revolved around the

allegations that the Petitioner No.2 is detained by the Respondent Nos.1 and 2 against his wish.

8. Ms. Manjiri Parasnis, learned counsel appearing for the Respondent No.5 submitted that, even the Respondent No.5 is not allowed to meet the Petitioner No.2. However, the petition is not filed by him and he is only a Respondent. It is not the case of the Petitioner that the Petitioner No.2 is detained by the Respondent No.5. The main grievance appears to be against the Respondent Nos.1 to 4. However, as mentioned earlier, in view of the police report, no further directions can be given in this petition.

9. It is made clear that the Petitioner No.1 is at liberty to adopt appropriate proceedings in accordance with law for her grievance.

10. With these observations, the petition is disposed of.

(SANDESH D. PATIL, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)