

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1409 OF 2026**

Dr. Sangram Patil : Petitioner.

Versus.

Vilas Ramchandra Rane,
The Police Inspector,
(Through N. M. Joshi Marg Police
Station) and ors. : Respondents.

Mr. Rajiv Shakdher, learned Senior Advocate a/w Mr. Ujjwalkumar Chavhan Karan Khetani, Jayesh Rathod and Saurabh Rajeshirke and Sana Shaikh and Aditya Hire i/by Advocate Bhushan Yadav for the Petitioner.

Mr. Milind Sathe, Advocate General for Maharashtra a/w Mr. Shishir Hiray, Chief Public Prosecutor, Mrs. Mankuwar Deshmukh, Addl. PP, Mr. Shubham Joshi and Mr. Ankit Patil for the Respondent/State.

Mr. Sumit Patil for Respondent No.5.

DCP Rajtilak Roushan, PI Sadanad Yerekar, PI Sharad Dharade of Crime Branch Mumbai present.

Sr. PI Vilas Rane and PSI Vijay Tope of N. M. Joshi Marg, Police Station, Mumbai present.

CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.

DATED : 05 MAY 2026

PC:-

1. This matter is not on board.
2. At the request of Mr. Rajiv Shakdher learned Senior Advocate for the Petitioner and with the consent of Mr. Milind

Sathe learned Advocate General for the State of Maharashtra, this matter is taken up in the afternoon session. Taken on board.

3. On 15th April 2026 the following order was made :-

1. *This matter is listed at Sr. No. 44 on today's "Daily Board". At 11.00 a.m. Mr. Rajiv Shakhder, Senior Counsel appearing through V.C. for the Petitioner, requested that this matter be taken up post lunch session, following "Fresh Matter Board". Mr. R. Shakhder states that the Advocate General appearing for the State will be informed of the same.*

2. *At 12.00 noon, Mr. Jayesh Rathod, learned Advocate for the Petitioner, appears and states that the Advocate General appearing for the Respondent/State is not available in the afternoon session and therefore requests that this matter be taken up in the pre-lunch session in view of the urgency in the matter. At the request of Mr. Jayesh Rathod, learned Advocate for the Petitioner and by consent of Mr. Sukanta Karmakar, learned APP for the Respondent/State, this matter was fixed for 1.30 pm.*

3. *The petition was called out at 1.30 pm.*

4. *Heard, Mr. Rajiv Sakdher, learned Senior Advocate for the Petitioner, Mr. Milind Sathe, learned Advocate General of Maharashtra, along with Mrs. P P Deshmukh, learned Chief Public Prosecutor and Mr. Aniket Nikam, learned Advocate for Respondent No. 5.*

5. **Rule.** *Rule is made returnable after eight weeks for the final hearing.*

6. *Mr. Sukanta Karmakar, learned APP waives service of Rule on behalf of the Respondent/State. Mr. Aniket Nikam, learned Advocate, appears and waives service of Rule on behalf of Respondent No.5.*

7. *Mr. Rajiv Sukdher, learned Senior Advocate for the Petitioner, states that pursuant to the order dated 23rd March 2026, the Petitioner has filed his Affidavit dated 24th March 2026 (at Page Nos. 94 to 100 of the petition paper book). He refers to paragraph 9 of the Affidavit, which is reproduced below :-*

"9 On reflection, I realise that the language used in the said post may be perceived as harsh and inappropriate. I

sincerely state that if the subject post hurt the sentiments of any person, I regret the same. This statement is made in good faith and without admission of any offence.”

8. *Mr. Rajiv Sukdher, learned Senior Advocate for the Petitioner, states that the Petitioner is a Doctor by profession and has been in India since 10th January 2026, which has resulted in the possibility of his being removed from his job. He submits that the Petitioner is a consultant with the National Health Service in the United Kingdom. He submits that, pending the present Petition, the Petitioner may be permitted to travel for the purpose of joining his duty in the United Kingdom, subject to such terms and conditions as this Court may deem fit to impose for lifting the LOC issued against the Petitioner. He, on instructions from the Petitioner, submits that the Petitioner shall give his undertaking, as well as the undertaking of his parents, who are permanent residents of India, that the Petitioner shall appear and attend before the Investigating Officer as and when required for investigation, subject to an advance notice of 15 (fifteen) days. He submits that the Petitioner will furnish his official email and contact number for service of notice by the Investigating Officer. He, on instructions from the Petitioner, states that the Petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation in the present crime.*

9. *Mr. Milind Sathe, the learned Advocate General for the Respondent/State, submits that the investigation in the present crime is proceeding, but it is taking time because certain reports are awaited from the investigating agencies. In all fairness, he submits that if all the reports required by the Investigating Officer are not received within three weeks from 20th April 2026, the State has no objection to lifting the LOC, subject to the Petitioner giving his personal undertaking to this Court and the undertaking of his parents guaranteeing the Petitioner's return to India for investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer in the present crime. To clarify, he submits that the undertaking should be from the Petitioner that he shall return to India and appear and attend before the Investigating Officer as and when required for the investigation, with notice to be issued to the Petitioner 15 (fifteen) days in advance. He submits that the Petitioner should provide his official E-mail, his personal E-mail and his mobile number (WhatsApp) in his undertaking, on which the Investigating Officer would send the notice. He submits that, in addition to the Petitioner's undertaking, the Petitioner's parents should also give an undertaking that they will ensure the Petitioner's presence in India as and when required by the Investigating Agency for the purpose of the investigation in the present crime. He submits that the Petitioner's parents should also furnish*

details of their email/contact number in their undertaking. He submits that service of notice will be on the said email / Whatsapp number mentioned in the undertaking by the Petitioner and his parents. Mr. Milind Sathe, the learned Advocate General, submits that the Petitioner must cooperate in the investigation and the undertaking must be in compliance with the requirements as mentioned herein above.

10. *Mr. Rajiv Sakdher, learned Senior Advocate for the Petitioner, on instructions from the Petitioner, states that the Petitioner agrees to furnish the undertaking in the manner referred to by the learned Advocate General and that the draft copies of the Petitioner's undertaking and his parents' undertaking will be forwarded to the office of the Chief Public Prosecutor within 10 (ten) days from today, so that the undertakings are in line with the requirements as stated above by Mr. Milind Sathe, learned Advocate General for the Respondent/State.*

11. *At the request of Mr. Rajiv Sakdher, the learned Senior Advocate for the Petitioner and by consent of Mr. Milind Sathe, the learned Advocate General for the Respondent/State, list this matter on 5th May 2026 for acceptance of the undertakings. Mr Rajiv Sakdher requests that this matter be listed first on the Board.*

12. *List this petition on 5th May 2026.*

4. Today, Mr. Rajiv Shakhder, Senior Advocate for the Petitioner, states that the Petitioner and his parents (Mr. Gokulsingh Indrasingh Patil and Kalpana Gokulsingh Patil) have filed their undertakings, both dated 24th April 2026. The said undertakings (page Nos. 1 to 9) dated 24th April 2026, filed by the Petitioner and his parents, are marked with “**X-colly**” for identification.

5. Mr. Milind Sathe, learned Advocate General for the State of Maharashtra, states that the statements made and undertakings given by the Petitioner and his parents (Mr. Gokulsingh Indrasingh Patil and Kalpana Gokulsingh Patil)

may be accepted as undertakings to this Court. The statements and undertakings given by the Petitioner and his parents (Mr. Gokulsingh Indrasingh Patil and Kalpana Gokulsingh Patil) in their undertakings (“X-colly”) are accepted as statements and undertakings to this Court.

6. Mr. Milind Sathe, learned Advocate General, submits that Respondent No.1 is satisfied with the undertakings and based on the said undertakings, Respondent No.1 shall modify the LOC dated 22nd December 2025 read with 10th January 2026. To clarify, Mr. Milind Sathe learned Advocate General, states that, by virtue of the said modification of the LOC dated 22nd December 2025 read with 10th January 2026, the Petitioner would be able to travel outside India.

7. Mr. Milind Sathe, learned Advocate General, states that the said modification would be communicated to the concerned Authorities on or before 11th May 2026.

8. Mr. Rajiv Shakhder learned Senior Advocate for the Petitioner and Mr. Milind Sathe, learned Advocate General, submit that no further orders are required.

9. This Petition is admitted on 15th April 2026.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)