

BHARAT
DASHARATH
PANDIT

Digitally signed by
BHARAT
DASHARATH
PANDIT
Date: 2026.04.05
12:06:23 +0530

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 747 OF 2026

Shakti @ Lucky Vilas Innarkar Petitioner.
V/s.
The State of Maharashtra and Anr. Respondents.

Mr. Saurabh Jagtap with Mr. Harshwardhan Karande, Advocates for the Petitioner.

Mr. S.V. Gavand, Addl. P.P. for the respondent nos.1 and 2.

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

DATE : 1ST APRIL 2026

P.C. :

The petitioner is aggrieved by the detention order dated 29th October 2025 which has been confirmed by an order dated 2nd December 2025.

2. Mr. Saurabh Jagtap, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that two criminal complaints were filed against the petitioner by some lady out of mutual rivalry and there is no such conduct of the petitioner which shall adversely affect the public order. The learned counsel for the petitioner refers to a decision in Criminal Writ Petition No.327 of 2025 titled “*Akshay Digambar Gaikwad v. The State of Maharashtra & Anr.*” and submits that there is a distinction between “disturbance to law and order” and “maintenance of public order”.

3. The order dated 29th October 2025 records that the petitioner is a weapon-wielding dangerous recidivist of violent nature who has indulged in criminal activities which create terror in the society. There are atleast five criminal cases of serious nature registered

against the petitioner. All those criminal cases are pending in the Court. The pattern of criminal activities of the petitioner indicates that he has been continuously engaging himself in commission of the crime inasmuch as two criminal cases vide C.R. No.177 of 2022 and C.R. No.596 of 2022 in the year 2022, two criminal cases vide C.R. No.176 of 2023 and C.R. No.199 of 2023 in the year 2023 and two criminal cases vide C.R. No.67 of 2025 and C.R. No. 95 of 2025 in the year 2025 were lodged against him. The Detaining Authority has recorded its satisfaction that no deterrent effect could be seen on the petitioner on account of previous detention actions. There are other materials which also were taken into consideration by the Commissioner of Police, Pune City who has passed the Detention Order against the petitioner.

4. This is well settled law, as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in "*Subramanian v. State of Tamil Nadu*"¹ that the writ Court shall have a limited jurisdiction to look into subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority and no interference is warranted unless it is demonstrated before the Court that the subjective satisfaction so arrived at by the Detaining Authority is based on no material. Present is not a case of that nature. In "*Akshay Digambar Gaikwad*", Detaining Authority has taken note of two cases which, according to the learned single Judge, would not have any impact on the society at large, whereas there are six criminal cases registered against the petitioner and a detention order was passed against him in the past also.

5. Writ Petition No.747 of 2026 is dismissed.

[GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.]

[CHIEF JUSTICE]

¹ (2012) 4 SCC 699