

ITEM NO.12 + 13

COURT NO.5

SECTION II-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 9883/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 04-07-2025 in CRWP No. 457/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay at Aurangabad]

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

VIJAYABAI VYANKAT SURYAWANSHI

Respondent(s)

IA No. 158084/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 158085/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.
IA No. 159186/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

WITH

Diary No(s). 39453/2025 (II-A)

IA No. 172406/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 172409/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 172410/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..)

Diary No(s). 37410/2025

IA No. 172090/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 172091/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 172094/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..)

Date : 30-07-2025 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Shivaji M. Jadhav, Adv.
Mr. Brij Kishor Sah, Adv.
Mr. Adarsh Kumar Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Vignesh Singh, Adv.
Mr. Aditya S. Jadhav, Adv.
Mr. Aakash Shankar, Adv.
Mr. Shivaji M. Jadhav, AOR

Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG (not present)
Mr. Siddharth Dharmadhikari, Adv.
Mr. Aaditya Aniruddha Pande, AOR
Mr. Shrirang B. Varma, Adv.
Mr. Bharat Bagla, Adv.
Mr. Sourav Singh, Adv.

Mr. Aditya Krishna, Adv.
Mr. Adarsh Dubey, Adv.
Ms. Chitransha Singh Sikarwar, Adv.

Mr. Dama Seshadri Naidu, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Anand Dilip Landge, AOR
Ms. D Poornima, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Prakash Ambedkar, Adv.
Mr. Pratik R. Bombarde, AOR
Ms. Kirti Anand, Adv.
Mr. Jitendra Kumar, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Permission to file Special Leave Petitions are granted.

We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties.

Mr. D.S. Naidu, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner and other counsel appearing for the other petitioner(s), would submit that a direction to register the FIR issued by the High Court in the impugned judgment cannot be construed to mean that all the police personnel should be roped in as an accused, as some of them were not even available at the relevant point of time.

Learned counsel appearing for the respondent/complainant would submit that the complaint does not disclose the name of any accused.

An FIR is expected to be registered against a crime. It is the case of the respondent herself that no specific name has been referred to in the complaint. Be that as it may, the impugned order will have to be construed to mean that an FIR has to be registered for the offences alleged to have been committed.

Thus, we make it clear that there is no need to refer to

the name of any accused in the FIR, unless the officer concerned is convinced of the specific role said to have been played by a person concerned.

With the aforesaid clarifications, the Special Leave Petitions are disposed of.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SWETA BALODI)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POONAM VAID)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR