

bdp

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

WRIT PETITION (STAMP) NO. 11986 OF 2026

Argonda Arvind @ Adithya Prakash Kumar,]
Aged 45 years, Indian Inhabitant,]
permanently residing at 8-7-133/132,]
Ghori Nagar, Old Bowenpally, Tirumalagiri,]
Hyderabad – 500 011, Telangana and]
at present in Arthur Road Jail, Mumbai.] **.. Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,]
Through the Secretary,]
The Ministry of Home Affairs,]
2nd Floor, Madam Cama Marg,]
Hutatma Rajguru Chowk,]
Mantralaya, Mumbai – 400 032.]
2. Commissioner of Police, Pune City]
Sadhu Vaswani Chowk, Church Path,]
Agarkar Nagar, Pune – 411 001.]
3. Commissioner of Police, Mumbai]
Crawford Market, Lokmanya Tilak Road,]
Police Colony, Dhobi Talao,]
Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus area,]
Fort, Mumbai – 400 001.]
4. Senior Inspector of Police/Investigating Officer,]
Yerwada Police Station, Pune City.]
5. Senior Inspector of Police/Investigating Officer,]
Powai Police Station, Mumbai.]
6. Senior Inspector of Police/Investigating Officer,]
Andheri Police Station, Mumbai.]
7. Senior Inspector of Police/Investigating Officer,]
D.B. Marg Police Station, Mumbai.] **.. Respondents**

Mr. Siddharth Subhash Jha with Mr. Chetan Gogawale, Advocates, i/by Law Global Advocates, for the Petitioner.

Ms. Pallavi N. Dabholkar, APP for the Respondent-State of Maharashtra.

PI Sandeep Shinde, D.C.B., C.I.D., Unit-10 is present in Court.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, ACJ. &
GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.**

RESERVED ON : 21st JULY, 2026.

PRONOUNCED ON : 28th JULY, 2026

JUDGMENT: (Per Gautam A. Ankhad, J.)

1. Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith and heard finally by consent of the parties.

2. The Petitioner has filed this Petition seeking directions for clubbing, consolidation and transfer of multiple FIRs registered in the State of Maharashtra against the Petitioner. It is alleged in the FIRs that large amounts were received by the accused from the students/parents of the students seeking admission for Medical Courses under the pretext of counselling fee, processing fee, college fee in return of admission in the Medical Colleges.

3. Mr. Jha, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner submits that the allegations in the FIRs are not isolated or disconnected. They arise out of one business model and continuing course of conduct and separate investigation by different Police Stations will result in conflicting investigations and overlapping of the accused persons. The four subject FIRs arise from the same medical admission / counselling activities conducted through Eduvio Learning Solutions Private Limited under the trade name Eduvio NEET Counselling. The subject FIRs registered between 18th March, 2026 and 28th April 2026 are (i) FIR No.0301 of 2026 registered with Powai Police Station, Mumbai; (ii) FIR No.0317 of 2026 registered with Andheri Police Station, Mumbai; (iii) FIR No.0679 of 2026 registered with D.B. Marg Police Station, Mumbai; and (iv) FIR No.0165 of 2026 registered with Yerwada Police Station, Pune City. The bank account records, electronic devices, social-media accounts, call-detail records, digital communications and other documents collected in one FIR would necessarily be relevant to the others. Hence, it is submitted that the investigation in the said FIRs be clubbed and consolidated.

4. Mr. Jha also prays that the Respondents be directed not to register any fresh FIRs on the basis of any subsequent

complaints concerning the same occurrence/transaction and that if any such complaints are filed, the same be treated as statement of witnesses under Section 181 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

5. Ms. Pallavi Dabholkar, the learned APP opposes the relief for grant of any blanket order, directing the Respondents not to register FIRs against the Petitioner on the basis of any subsequent complaints. She submits that as and when same is filed, it is always open to the Petitioner to adopt such steps as may be available in law. The learned APP submits that the FIRs have been transferred to Economic Offences Wing and the charge-sheets have already been filed in 37th Esplanade Court, Mumbai in respect of FIR No.0301 of 2026 and FIR No.0317 of 2026. The learned APP submits that, at best, 3 FIRs that are lodged in Mumbai could be clubbed together and the FIR that is lodged in Pune City ought to be kept separately since it would cause great prejudice to the complainants/witnesses who would need to travel to Mumbai for the said matter.

6. We have heard the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the parties and have perused the record. The investigation

is being conducted in Mumbai by Economic Offences Wing, Mumbai. The charge-sheet has already been filed with respect to first two FIRs before the 37th Esplanade Court, Mumbai. We are informed that charge-sheet in the third FIR filed in Mumbai would also be filed before the same Court. Thus, it is in the interest of justice and to avoid any duplication of evidence and multiple trials that the 3 FIRs that are filed in Mumbai are clubbed/consolidated.

7. As regards the FIR registered in Pune, we accept the learned APP's submission that unnecessary prejudice and inconvenience will be caused to the witnesses/complainants who are from Pune. We are also not inclined to grant any blanket order of injunction, restraining the Respondents from registration of any fresh FIRs against the Petitioner on the basis of any subsequent complaints. It is not possible for us to determine today whether FIRs filed in future would pertain to independent transactions. As and when such complaints are filed, the Petitioner is at liberty to deal with the same and adopt appropriate proceedings as may be available in law.

8. Mr. Jha has relied upon the judgment in ***Odela Satyam and Anr. vs. State of Telangana, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2080*** and

Abhishek Singh Chauhan vs. Union of India and Ors., 2022 SC OnLine SC 1936. In *Odela Satyam* (supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that prayer regarding non-registration of future FIRs cannot be granted by any Court of law, following the judgment in *Amandeep Singh Saran vs. State of Delhi and Others, 2023 SCC Online SC 1851.* As regards the judgment in *Abhishek Singh Chauhan* (supra), the Court clubbed the FIRs and granted bail in connection with the principal FIR since trial had commenced and the Hon'ble Court exercised its powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India. The Hon'ble Court recorded that the concerned State had no objection for abiding with such dispensation.

9. We clarify that we have not heard the matter on merits and it is open for the Respondents to conclude the investigation and for the relevant jurisdictional Court to determine the same in accordance with law.

10. **The Writ Petition is partly allowed and disposed off in the above terms.**

11. **Rule is partly made absolute.**

[GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.]

[ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE]

BHARAT
DASHARATH
PANDIT

Digitally signed by
BHARAT
DASHARATH
PANDIT
Date: 2026.07.28
14:28:11 +0530