

*lgc*

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

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 695 OF 2026**

Aishwarya Vivekanand Mayekar : Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and anr. : Respondents.

---

**Mr. Vinayak Pandit i/by Advocate Ajinkya Udane, for the  
Petitioner.**

**Mr. Sukanta A Karmarkar, APP for the Respondent/State.**

**Mr. Manoj Borkar, for the Respondent No.2.**

-----  
**CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.**

**DATED : 17 FEBRUARY 2026**

**PC:-**

**1.** Heard Mr. Vinayak Pandit, learned Advocate for the Petitioner, Mr. Sukanta Karmarkar, learned APP for the Respondent/State and Mr. Manoj Borkar, learned Advocate for Respondent No.2.

**2.** This Petition, at the instance of the Complainant, assails the order dated 22.12.2025 passed by the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, 31st Court, Vikhroli, Mumbai

(Magistrate), in C.C. No. 1106/PW/2021 in C.R. No. 669 of 2021 (“impugned order”), by which the Magistrate allowed the Application filed by Respondent No. 2 seeking permission to travel abroad.

3. Mr. Vinayak Pandit, learned Advocate for the Petitioner, submits that the impugned order is challenged solely on the ground that if the Respondent No.2 is permitted to travel abroad, the disposal of the Criminal Case No.1106/PW/2021 pending on the file of the Magistrate would be delayed. On this ground, the Petitioner has challenged the impugned order.

4. Mr. Sukanta Karmarkar, learned APP, and Mr. Manoj Borkar, learned Advocate for Respondent No. 2, submit that the impugned order addresses the situation the Petitioner seeks to raise as a ground to question the impugned order, which, according to them, is a well-reasoned and well-considered order.

5. Arguments heard. Perused records.

6. After hearing the Petitioner, the Respondent No.2 and the Prosecution, the Magistrate has allowed the Application filed by the Respondent No.2 and permitted the Respondent No.2 to travel abroad, subject to the conditions mentioned in Paras 2(a) to 2(f) of the operative part of the impugned order.

7. Conditions Nos. 2(d) and 2(f) of the impugned order read as follows:

*“2(d) He shall given undertaking disclosing the name of his advocate, that his advocate will represent him before this court on every date of case and he shall not extend his period of stay at abroad as mentioned above.*

*2(f) Accused/applicant should not dispute identity, during trial if the matter is proceed in his absence.”*

8. The Magistrate has addressed the apprehension, as sought to be expressed by the Petitioner, before this Court.

9. Mr. Vinayak Pandit, learned Advocate for the Petitioner, has failed to show any perversity or any jurisdictional error in the impugned order.

10. In view of the above, no case is made out to entertain this Petition.

11. This Criminal Writ Petition is, therefore, dismissed. No order as to costs.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)