



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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 6214 OF 2025

Jitendra Punamchand Maru .. Petitioner
Vs.
The Central Bureau of Investigation
& Ors. .. Respondents

...

Mr. Rajendra Desai a/w Mr. Kunal Bhanage i/by Mr. Akshay Pawar, Advocates for the Petitioner.

Mr. Amit Munde, SPP a/w Mr. Jai Vohra for Respondent No.1-CBI.

Mr. Anil C. Singh, Additional Solicitor General a/w Ms. Neha N. Patil, AOR a/w Mr. Aditya Thakkar, Mr. Krishnakant Deshmukh, Adarsh Vyas, Rama Gupta & Mr. Rajdatt Nagre for Respondent No.2-UoI.

Mr. S. V. Gavand, Additional Public Prosecutor for Respondent No.3-State.

...

**CORAM : SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR, CJ &
SUMAN SHYAM, J.**

**Reserved on : 23rd March 2026
Pronounced on : 27th March 2026**

ORDER :

The petitioner has invoked the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for a direction to the Central Bureau of Investigation (in short, CBI) to register a First Information Report and investigate the matter relating to the offence of bribery as disclosed by him in his letters dated 21st October 2025 and 29th October 2025.



2. On 23rd March 2026, the following order was passed by this Court:-

"On 10th March 2026, we passed the following order:

"Mr. Kunal Bhanage, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks an adjournment on the ground that the arguing counsel is not available today.

2. This is another petition filed by Jitendra Punamchand Maru, who simply states that he is a citizen of India and his right to set the criminal law in motion has been recognized by law. Except that, the petitioner does not say anything about him.

3. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner has filed this writ petition without making any disclosure as per the Bombay High Court Rules, we hereby direct the petitioner to remain physically present in the Court on the next day.

4. Post this matter on 23rd March 2026 together with Criminal Writ Petition No.5542 of 2025."

2. The petitioner is present in the Court and states that previously he was engaged in the business of sale of plastics. But presently there is no business activity carried out by him. On a Court's query what is the source of information on the basis of which this writ petition has been filed, Mr.Rajendra Desai, the learned counsel for the petitioner, who is present in the Court, states that after the petitioner came to know about a decision rendered by the Eastern District Court of New York, he made an application for obtaining a true attested copy of the said judgment and the present writ petition has been filed.

3. Mr. Anil C. Singh, the learned Additional Solicitor General raises objection to the maintainability of the writ petition. The learned Additional Solicitor General refers to an order passed by the High Court of Delhi in Writ Petition (C) 812/2026 tilted "Ravi Sharma, Advocate v. Union of India & Ors." and submits that a similar petition, though labelled as Public Interest Litigation, has been dismissed by the High Court of Delhi, a copy of which has been tendered in the Court.

4. Judgment is reserved."

3. The petitioner states that the Ministry of Renewable Energy formed a body in the name of Solar Energy Corporation of India to explore the possibility of increasing use of renewable energy in India and different State Governments entered into



power purchase agreements for distribution of electricity to the consumers. It was around the year 2020 that an Indian Corporate group entered into a conspiracy with Azure Global Ltd. which also claimed to generate solar power to procure contracts by using unlawful means. He further states that these Corporate groups created a Multi Million Dollar Pension Funds for the purpose of bribing several unknown government officials. The petitioner refers to an order passed by the United States District Court, Eastern Court of New York and states that the Indian Corporate group proposed to pay incentives which was nothing but bribe. The petitioner has also referred to the order dated 24th November 2024 for Jury Trial whereunder a notice was proposed to be given to the defendants who are the Chairman, Executive Director, Managing Director etc. of the Indian Corporate group. However, there is no further information provided by the petitioner as to the continuance of any proceedings in the US Court.

4. Mr. Anil C. Singh, learned Additional Solicitor General raised an objection to maintainability of this writ petition and referred to an order passed by the Delhi High Court by which a similar petition against the same Corporate groups labelled as public interest litigation was dismissed.

5. In the order dated 10th March 2026, the Delhi High Court observed that the Jury Trial demanded by the US Securities and Exchange Commission does not even indicate any loss to public exchequer.

6. To begin with, we may indicate that this writ petition is



similar to Criminal Writ Petition No.5542 of 2025 wherein the petitioner has made a similar adventure seeking lodging of criminal case by the CBI against another Corporate group of India. This writ petition is clearly an abuse of the process of the Court. The petitioner who states that his right to put the criminal justice system in motion is recognized in law has failed to provide any justification for not approaching the Court in the last about one decade when someone had allegedly tried to indulge in some unethical practices. In course of the hearing, the petitioner who was present in the Court stated that previously he was engaged in the business of sale of plastic but, presently, he is not carrying on any business activity. The learned counsel for the petitioner stated that this writ petition has been filed on the basis of the newspaper report which published the order passed by the US Court.

7. In a writ petition of this nature, the High Court is required to examine whether the petitioner is seeking any personal gain or there is a private or oblique motive behind filing of the petition. The registration of a criminal case is a very serious matter and it entails drastic consequences to the proposed accused person. This is the duty of the High Court to examine the relevant materials and bestow its considerations as to whether the prayer if granted would serve any public cause. This is the experience across the High Courts that the writ petitions of this kind or a petition masked as a public interest litigation is filed at the behest of the failed competitors or a rival business house or a disgruntled person.

8. In our opinion, the petitioner has failed to establish his



bona fide. The petitioner has no locus to file this writ petition and he has not approached the Court with clean hands. This writ petition does not serve any public purpose. Rather, a petition like the present one causes serious harms and is likely to cause harm to the reputation and business prospects of any Corporate group.

9. For the aforesaid reasons, we do not find any merit in this writ petition which is, accordingly, dismissed.

[SUMAN SHYAM, J.]

[CHIEF JUSTICE]

PRAVIN
DASHARATH
PANDIT
Digitally signed
by PRAVIN
DASHARATH
PANDIT
Date:
2026.04.10
13:01:49 +0530