



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 914 OF 2025

(Linkhouse Industries Limited, through its Director & Anr. Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. G.S. Gour, Counsel for the petitioners.
Mr. S.S. Doifode, APP for respondent nos. 1 and 2/State.
Mr. Virat Mishra, Counsel for respondent no.4.

.....

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE AND
NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.
JANUARY 29, 2026

The Counsel for the petitioners seeks time to
file additional affidavit in compliance of order dated
19/1/2026.

2] The Counsel for respondent no.4 has invited
our attention to the statement made by him as recorded
in paragraph 6 of our order dated 19/1/2026. The
statement reads as under :

*“6. The petitioners have made respondent
No.4 as party respondent in the appeal saying
that respondent No.4 has purchased the
property under question as also about his
possession.....”*

3] On the basis of the aforesaid statement, we
have drawn an inference that the petitioners were aware
of the fact that respondent no.4 has purchased the
property under question, and was, in fact, in possession.
We have further said that the petitioners have suppressed
these facts. Accordingly, the petitioners were called upon
to answer these allegations. The petitioners were also
directed to deposit Rs.1,00,000/- to show their *bona
fides*.

4] The Counsel for respondent no.4 submits that the aforesaid statement was inadvertently made. He submits that in the appeal preferred by the petitioners before this Court, respondent no.4 had instructed the Counsel to file an application for intervention disclosing all these facts. The Counsel thought that this plea had been taken by the petitioners in the appeal, and accordingly, made statement as noted in the order.

5] Thus, it is apparent that the Counsel for respondent no.4 made an incorrect statement may be because respondent no.4 has briefed him accordingly. We will consider the effect of such statement in due course.

6] In the circumstances, the petitioners need not file additional affidavit, as directed by us vide order dated 19/1/2026.

7] At this stage, the Counsel for the petitioners submits that the First Information Report has been lodged against respondent no.4. He submits that this development will redress its grievance to a certain extent. Accordingly, and on instructions, he seeks permission to withdraw the petition.

8] Permission is granted. The petition is disposed of as withdrawn. The Registry shall refund, to the petitioners, amount of Rs.1,00,000/- paid by them.

(JUDGE)

(JUDGE)

Sumit