

News

Singham-style: Supreme Court ruling on shooting at Ulhasnagar police station



According to the Court, the occurrence was so theatrical that it could stand alone as a script. It seemed like something from Singham.

The Supreme Court ruled on Monday that the Ulhasnagar police station firing case of 2024 was strikingly similar to sequences in the film Singham, as a political rivalry escalated into a violent shootout within the station.

Kunal Dilip Patil's bail request against a Bombay High Court ruling that denied him bail in the 2024 case was being heard by a bench of Justices Vikram Nath and Sandeep Mehta.

Due to a fierce political rivalry and land dispute between former MLA Ganpat Gaikwad and Mahesh Gaikwad, Patil is accused of holding back the former Corporator Mahesh Gaikwad's bodyguard during a gunfight inside the station.

"It felt like something from Singham," the Bench said, "so cinematic that it could stand alone as a script."

"This reminded us of '**Singham**'." Only the narrative with the slogan from this tale should be used," Justice Sandeep Mehta said in an oral statement.

Senior Advocate Siddharth Dave, who represented Patil, contended that he was not inside the cabin when the incident occurred and that he was not the one who fired fire. He said that the MLA actually fired the pistol, and the only accusation against Patil is that he restrained the bodyguard following the shooting.

Dave further claimed that Patil's supposed role is similar to that of co-accused who have previously been released on bond, that he was not listed in the first First Information Report (FIR), and that he only entered the cabin after the firing.

Justice Sandeep Mehta then questioned if the firing had truly taken place within a police station. According to Dave, the MLA was the one who fired from inside the cabin.

The episode was reminiscent of Singham, Justice Mehta said in joking, adding that it might nearly be a plot with its own slogan.

"Such a story would probably come out in a few years," Dave continued.

Following the hearing of the arguments, the court allowed the petitioner to implead the victims as respondents and sent notice to the State of Maharashtra.

"As soon as notice is served, issue the notice... list. The Bench said that the petitioner could implead the victims as respondent number 2.