

GAYATRI
RAJENDRA
SHIMPI

Digitally signed
by GAYATRI
RAJENDRA
SHIMPI
Date: 2026.04.30
21:04:52 +0530

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

(Sr. No. 7) WRIT PETITION NO. 1816 OF 2026

Tanveer Mohammed Shafi

Shaikh @Papa Shaikh

... Petitioner

Verus.

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

(Sr. No. 15) WRIT PETITION NO. 1829 OF 2026

Tanveer Mohammed Shafi

Shaikh @ Papa Shaikh

... Petitioner

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondents

(Sr. No. 16) WRIT PETITION NO. 1830 OF 2026

Tanveer Mohammed Shafi

Shaikh @Papa Shaikh

... Petitioner

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

Ms. Sana Khan (Thr. V. C) a/w Mr. Yash Sukana, Advocates for
Petitioner in all 3 Writ Petitions.

Mr. A. A. Palkar, APP for Respondent - State.

CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.

DATE : 21st APRIL, 2026

P.C. :

1. Heard Ms. Sana Khan, learned Advocate for the Petitioners in all these three Writ Petitions. She submits that the subject matter and the issues involved in all three Writ Petitions are common and therefore requests that all three Petitions be taken up together. At her request, these Petitions are taken up together.

2. Ms Sana Khan learned Advocate for the Petitioners in all three Writ Petitions, submits that the FIR bearing No. 35 of 2026 registered with Faraskhana Police Station, Pune (subject matter of Writ Petition No. 1829 of 2026), was the first FIR registered against the Petitioners. She submits that the FIR bearing No. 37 of 2026 (Criminal Writ Petition No. 1830 of 2026) is the second FIR in respect of the same offence/ event. She submits that the FIR bearing No. 38 of 2026 (subject of Writ Petition No. 1816 of 2026) is the third FIR in respect of the same offence/event. She by relying on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of T. T. Antony Vs. State of Kerala & Ors¹.submits that FIR bearing No. 35 of 2026 is required to be treated as the FIR and the

¹ (2001) 6 SCC 181

subsequent FIR's (i.e. FIR Nos. 37 of 2026 and 38 of 2006) which are in respect of the same offence/ event are required to be treated as supplementary charge-sheets in the first FIR No. 35 of 2026.

3. Issue notice to Respondents.

4. Mr. A. A. Palkar, learned APP, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of Respondent No. 1.

5. As the issue raised in the Petitions is limited, Ms. Sana Khan and Mr. A. A. Palkar request that these Petitions be finally disposed of at the stage of admission.

6. Mr. A. A. Palkar, learned APP for the State, submits that FIR No. 35 of 2026 is required to be treated as the FIR and the two FIR bearing Nos. 37 of 2026 and 38 of 2026 which are in respect of the same offence/event are required to be treated as supplementary charge-sheets in the first FIR No. 35 of 2026. He relies on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Amitbhai Anilchandra Shah Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Anr².

² (2013) 6 SCC 348

7. Considering the submissions made by Ms. Sana Khan learned Advocate for the Petitioners and Mr. A. A. Palkar, learned APP for the State, the FIR bearing Nos. 37 and 38 of 2026 shall be treated as supplementary charge-sheets in the first FIR (i.e. FIR bearing No. 35 of 2026).

8. Ms. Sana Khan submits that the Petitions be disposed of in view of the above.

9. In view of the above, Writ Petition No. 1816 of 2026, Writ Petition No. 1829 of 2026 and Writ Petition No. 1830 of 2026 are disposed of.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)