

NON-REPORTABLE

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION**

TRANSFER PETITION (CRIMINAL) Nos. 333-348/2021

Ketan Kantilal Seth

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Gujarat & Ors.

..... Respondent(s)

With I.A. No. 134476 of 2021

ORDER

1. With the consent of the parties, these transfer petitions have been taken up for final hearing. The present petitions have been filed by petitioner/accused for invoking the power under Section 406 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as ‘CrPC’), seeking transfer of 16 criminal cases pending against him in four different States to one Court in Mumbai, where 3 cases are already pending. Following are the cases of which transfer are being sought –

- i. Criminal Case No. 101878/2003 arising out of FIR No. C.R. No. I-64/2002, dated 30.07.2002 registered at Police Station Udhana, Surat, Gujarat, pending before Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Surat;
- ii. Criminal Case No. 9166/2002 arising out of FIR No. I.C.R. No. 274/2002, dated 02.07.2002 registered at Police Station Umra, Surat, Gujarat, pending before Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Surat;
- iii. Criminal Case No. 174/2003 arising out of FIR No. C. R. No. I-226/2002, dated 30.08.2002 registered at Police Station Rander, Surat, Gujarat, pending before Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Surat;
- iv. Criminal Case No. 100521/2003 arising out FIR No. 274/2002, dated 06.08.2002 registered at Police Station Varachha, Surat, Gujarat, pending before Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate/Judicial Magistrate First Class, Surat;
- v. Criminal Case No. 2778/2004 arising out of FIR/M. Case No. 3/2002, dated 16.07.2002 registered at Police

Station Gandevi, Navsari, Gujarat, pending before
Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gandevi;

- vi. Criminal Case No. 6840/2002 arising out of FIR No. I-93/2002, dated 18.08.2002 registered at Police Station Navsai Town, Navsari, Gujarat, pending before Chief Judicial Magistrate, Navsari;
- vii. Criminal Case No. 2121/2002 arising out of FIR No. I-119/2002, dated 10.06.2002 registered at Police Station Valsad City, Valsad, Gujarat, pending before Chief Judicial Magistrate, Valsad;
- viii. Criminal Case No. 1578/2006 arising out of FIR/M. Case No. 29/2002, dated 13.06.2002 registered at Police Station Vidya Nagar, Anand, Gujarat, pending before Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Anand;
- ix. Criminal Case No. 244/2002 arising out of FIR/M. Case No. 22/2002 (C.R. No. I-226/2002), dated 07.06.2002 registered at Police Station Morbi, Gujarat, pending before II Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Morbi;

- x. Criminal Case No. 40449/2016 arising out of FIR No. 280/2002, dated 04.05.2002 registered at Police Station Connaught Place, New Delhi, pending before Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Court, New Delhi;
- xi. Criminal Case No. 2034203/2016 arising out of FIR No. 242/2002, dated 17.06.2002 registered at Police Station Sarojini Nagar, New Delhi, pending before Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Saket Court, New Delhi;
- xii. Criminal Case No. ____/2002 arising out of FIR No. 298/2002, dated 22.08.2002 registered at Police Station Jagatdal, 24 North Paraganas, West Bengal, pending before Barrackpore Court, Kolkata;
- xiii. Criminal Case No. 147/2002 arising out of F.I.R. No. 97/2002, dated 25.04.2002 and C.R. No. 101/2002, dated 29.04.2002, both registered at Police Station Ganeshpeth, Nagpur, Maharashtra, pending before 155-II Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nagpur;

- xiv. Criminal Case No. 847/2002 arising out of F.I.R. at C.R. No. 75/2002, dated 15.05.2002 registered at Police Station City Kotwali, Amravati, Maharashtra, pending before Chief Judicial Magistrate, Amravati;
- xv. Criminal Case No. 498/2002 arising out of F.I.R. at C.R. No. 102/2002, dated 08.05.2002 registered at Police Station Pimpri, Pune, Maharashtra, pending before Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pimpri, Pune;
- xvi. Criminal Case No. 357/2002 arising out of F.I.R. at C.R. No. 65/2002, dated 15.05.2002 registered at Police Station Vishrambaug, Pune, Maharashtra, pending before III Judicial Magistrate First Class, Shivaji Nagar, Pune.

In fact, the basic object to file these transfer petitions is to get all cases transferred at one place and may be directed to try together.

2. In a nutshell, the prosecution story in majority of the cases revolves around one accused company namely M/s Home Trade Limited, which is alleged to have engaged in the business of

Stock, Securities, Brokering and Trading. The allegations against the petitioner herein and one Sanjay Hariram Agarwal are that they were the authorized signatories of the accused company and while acting in the capacity of Directors of the said accused company, they entered into several transactions dealing with government

securities and further sold the said securities without any authorization. Further, it has also been alleged that the government securities were not delivered within time and the money raised thereby has been misappropriated by the accused persons including the petitioner herein.

3. During the pendency of the instant petitions, application for intervention (bearing I.A. No. 134476 of 2021) has also been filed on behalf of one applicant namely; Omprakash Bhaurao Kamdi, seeking permission to intervene on the grounds of being a 'necessary' and 'proper' party as stated in the application.

4. Before advertng to merits of the transfer petitions, the application seeking intervention is being taken up for disposal. The intervenor claims to be an agriculturist who is dependent on

financial aid provided by Nagpur District Central Cooperative Bank Limited (hereinafter referred as NDCCB) for his day-to-day agricultural activities. It is said Chairman of NDCCB, who lodged an FIR in 2002 against the petitioner and other accused persons alleging non-delivery of the government securities worth Rs. 125 crores which NDCCB purchased through accused company in which petitioner and other accused persons were directors. The petitioner also sought transfer of concerned trial in the instant transfer petitions.

5. It is a settled principle of law in criminal jurisprudence that intervention application filed by a third party should not ordinarily be allowed in criminal cases unless the Court is satisfied that on the grounds on which the person seeking intervention is directly or substantially related to the case and question of law which may affect him adversely; or in the opinion of Court, joining the intervenor in the case is expedient in public interest. Having perused the contents of intervention application, nothing is averred in the application, how non-joining of applicant may cause prejudice or affect the public interest. The

applicant is neither a complainant in any of the cases of which transfer is being sought, nor he has any direct involvement or ground of his joining in public interest. The intervenor has no locus to intervene in the present petition, therefore, I am of the opinion that the grounds as mentioned by the intervenor are not proper to allow the application. It is to observe that prayer in the present petition

is confined to transfer the criminal trials pending before Trial Courts in different States for trial by one Court in one State and in such circumstances, the prayer for intervention cannot be allowed for reasons mentioned above. Consequently, I.A. No. 134476 of 2021 seeking intervention stands dismissed.

6. Reverting to the merits of the transfer petitions, learned counsel for petitioner has contended that multiple FIRs were registered against petitioner and other accused persons in different States having similar set of allegations, which has led into multiple trials being pending before various Trial Courts in different States for adjudication. Most of the accused persons in all FIRs and witnesses thereof are common. However, for the

purpose of trial, all the accused as well witnesses have to attend hearing dates before various Courts leading to delay and huge expenses. Moreover, most of the transactions pertaining to the alleged offence have taken place in Mumbai, Maharashtra and as per the chart supplied by the petitioner, majority of the witnesses relevant for the purpose of trial are also from Mumbai. However, the petitioner has prayed the transfer of all cases for trial by one

Court primarily on the grounds of convenience, expeditious disposal and no-prejudice may be caused to the defence of the accused for fair trial and to secure ends of justice.

7. Per contra, the learned counsel for respondent has opposed the transfer petitions primarily on the ground that the transfer petitions have been filed belatedly. It has been contended that, High Court of Bombay vide order dated 24.06.2021 passed in Criminal Application No. 628/2014, directed the concerned Trial Court to complete the trial in C.C. No. 147/2002 (i.e. one of the cases of which transfer is being sought in the instant petitions) by passing final judgment and order within a maximum period of

four months. The proceedings in the said case are already at the final stage. Hence, the prayer of the petitioner seeking transfer of cases as mentioned deserves to be dismissed.

8. After having heard both the sides, the primary issue for consideration before this Court is *‘Whether the criminal cases pending before different Trial Courts in four States can be transferred to one Trial Court in one State?; Whether transfer of case of one of the criminal case which is at the final stage of trial before concerned Court in Nagpur, can be directed to be transferred at such belated stage?’*

9. To answer the aforesaid questions, first of all it is necessary to know the underlying intention of Section 406 of CrPC. Section 406 deals with the power of Supreme Court to transfer the cases. The Court can exercise such power for fair trial and to secure the ends of justice. The language impliedly left the transfer of the cases on the discretion of the Court. If the Court is satisfied that it is imperative to transfer the cases in the interest of justice or to secure ends of justice, then it may do so.

10. In the instant case, it is not in dispute that since 2002, multiple FIRs across four States namely; Gujarat, Maharashtra, New Delhi and West Bengal have been filed against petitioner and other accused persons containing broad and common allegations pertaining to act done in collusion by accused persons to defraud the complainants and misappropriate the money raised thereby while dealing/trading in government securities in the name of accused company M/s Home Trade Limited. The State in its counter affidavit has stated that during investigation, the accused

Company was found not to be eligible to deal in transactions relating to government securities, whereas, petitioner and other accused person namely Sanjay Hariram Agarwal were acting as Directors and authorized signatories of accused Company. From a bare perusal of the facts and FIRs, it is seen that there is commonality of facts in each FIR and that most of the transactions have taken place in Mumbai. Further, the FIRs mainly have petitioner and Sanjay Hariram Agarwal as common accused persons.

11. As per the details provided by petitioner in a chart annexed with petition, out of all the nineteen FIRs registered against petitioner and other accused persons, one FIR has been registered in Kolkata, West Bengal; two FIRs are registered in Delhi; nine FIRs are registered in different districts of Gujarat and seven FIRs are registered in different districts of Maharashtra. Furthermore, as stated by petitioner and unrefuted by respondent State, out of total 689 witnesses in all nineteen cases pending before respective Trial Courts, 236 witnesses are from Mumbai. It is further not disputed that in multiple cases, almost 20 years have lapsed and yet majority of the trials are pending at the initial stage. It wouldn't be out of place to mention that primary reason for such delay is the multiplicity of proceedings alongwith practical difficulties for the Trial Court to secure the presence of witnesses as well as accused for concluding the trial.

12. The contention of the State that prejudice will be caused if the transfer is allowed at such a belated stage when one of the criminal proceedings is at the final stage is bereft of merit. At

this juncture, it is apt to refer order dated 24.06.2021 passed by High Court of Judicature at Bombay in Criminal Application No. 628/2021 filed by accused Sanjay Hariram Agarwal seeking transfer of criminal cases pending against him. The same is reproduced for ready reference as thus:

“.....(ii) We direct that the trial in said C.C. No. 147/2002 (Crime No. 101/2002 registered with Ganesh Peth Police Station, Nagpur) be completed by passing final judgment and order within maximum period of four months from today. We make it clear that we are granting maximum four months’ time in view of Covid-19 restrictions.....

(iii) We make it clear that after completion of trial in said C.C. No. 147/2002 (Crime No. 101/2002 registered with Ganesh Peth Police Station, Nagpur) against other accused except the Applicant, the trial against Applicant be commenced by conducting the same expeditiously and preferably on day-to-day basis and the same be completed within a period of four months after commencement of trial against present Applicant.”

As is evident from the aforesaid order, the High Court directed completion of trial in C.C. No. 147/2002 in a time bound

manner against other accused persons except the applicant i.e., Sanjay Hariram Agarwal (accused no. 3 in C.C. No. 147/2002). The High Court further directed that once the trial against other accused persons is completed, then only trial against applicant therein shall commence. The High Court effectively split the trial of other accused persons from trial of Sanjay Hariram Agarwal and caused serious prejudice. As is gathered from the records and also stated above, accused Sanjay Hariram Agarwal alongwith petitioner herein were acting in the capacity of the Directors of accused company. The person who could have put the best defence (oral as well as documentary) before Trial Court where evidence led by prosecution was common and mostly related to same transaction, was effectively excluded by the order of High Court. In my considered view, such an approach taken by High Court is prima-facie amounts to differential treatment, causing serious prejudice to the right of fair trial of other accused persons including the petitioner herein.

13. In view of the foregoing discussion, considering the common nature of allegations raised against the petitioner in all

FIRs and criminal proceedings emanating therefrom which are yet pending before respective Trial Courts in four States, I am of the opinion that to meet the ends of justice and fair trial, the transfer petitions deserve to be allowed. Therefore, the instant transfer petitions are disposed-off with the following directions:-

- a) The criminal cases, as specified in para 1 (clause (i) to (xvi)) of this order shall be transferred from the courts, where those are pending, to the court of Principal Judge, Bombay City Civil and Sessions Court, Fort, Mumbai – 400032, Maharashtra;
- b) the Principal Judge is at liberty to assign the cases to any of the Court situated in his jurisdiction to try all those cases. He is also at liberty to assign some of the cases to any other courts also, if necessary;
- c) it is further directed that the transferor courts shall immediately transmit the record of concerned cases to the Principal Judge, Bombay City Civil and Sessions Court, Fort, Mumbai – 400032, which should reach on or before 31.10.2022;

- d) all the accused in the concerned cases shall appear before the Principal Judge, Bombay City Civil and Sessions Court, Fort, Mumbai on 14.11.2022;
- e) on assignment of those cases to the concerned Court(s), as directed hereinabove, the said Court(s) shall frame the charges within a period of two months from the date of appearance, or on securing presence of the accused persons, if absent; and thereafter the trial be concluded as expeditiously as possible, not later than two years. It is needless to observe that the examination of the witnesses in all cases will be recorded by the Court(s) separately, thereby it should not cause any prejudice to any accused.

.....J.
(J.K. MAHESHWARI)

**New Delhi;
September 9, 2022.**