

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

SUO MOTO PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 1 OF 2024

High Court on its Own Motion

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

***WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3591 OF 2024
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (STAMP) NO. 20622 OF 2024
IN
SUO MOTO PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 1 OF 2024***

XY

... Applicant

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN :

High Court on its Own Motion

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

***WITH
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 4107 OF 2024
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (STAMP) NO. 22062 OF 2024
IN
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 4107 OF 2024***

Anna Maruti Shinde

... Petitioner/
Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

WITH
CRIMINAL PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (STAMP) NO. 20094 OF 2024
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (STAMP) NO. 21495 OF 2024
IN
CRIMINAL PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (STAMP) NO. 20094 OF 2024

Ketan Tirodkar

... Petitioner/
Applicant

Versus

Police Commissioner, Thane & Ors.

... Respondents

Mr. Hiten S. Venegavkar, Public Prosecutor and Mr. V. B. Konde
Deshmukh, Addl. P.P. for the Respondent-State

Ms. Kavisha Khanna for the Intervener/Applicant in
IA/3591/2024 & IAST/20622/2024

Mr. Amit Katarnaware a/w Mr. Aditya Katarnaware for the
Petitioner in WP/4107/2024 and for the Applicant in
IAST/22062/2024

Mr. Rajabhau S. Chaudhari for the Petitioner in CRPIL
(ST)/20094/2024 and for the Applicant in IAST/21495/2024

Mr. Amol Koli, ACP, Ulhasnagar Division, is present

CORAM : REVATI MOHITE DERE &
PRITHVIRAJ K. CHAVAN, JJ.
THURSDAY, 19th DECEMBER 2024

P.C.:

1 Mr. Venegavkar, learned Public Prosecutor states that pursuant to the order dated 17th December 2024, the State has taken steps to facilitate the admission of the victim girls in a new school and that the State Government will bear the responsibility of paying the victims' school fees. He further states that the State Government will take all necessary steps to secure a refund of the fees previously paid to the schools where the girls were previously enrolled. Statement accepted.

2 On 17th December 2024, Mr. Katarnaware had disclosed to us through video-conferencing that he was unable to establish contact with the deceased's parents and that even his calls to them had gone unanswered. He had disclosed to us that the deceased's parents had never declined police protection and as such, the statement made by Mr. Venegavkar that the deceased's parents do not want police protection, was incorrect.

In view of the contrary statements made by Mr. Katarnaware and Mr. Venegavkar, we asked Mr. Venegavkar to ensure that the deceased's parents are produced before us through video-conferencing, since Mr. Katarnaware disclosed to us that their whereabouts were not known.

3 Instead of appearing through video-conferencing, the deceased's parents appeared in person before us. When questioned, they stated that they have never refused police protection and infact they want police protection, however, the police protection should not hinder or come in the way of their livelihood.

4 Considering what was disclosed to us by the deceased's parents, who are present in person before us, Mr. Venegavkar states that the police will assess the current threat perception to the deceased's parents and thereafter will take a decision as to whether police protection to the deceased's parents,

is warranted. He states that the said decision will be taken within one week from today. Statement accepted.

5 Stand over to 13th January 2025.

PRITHVIRAJ K. CHAVAN, J.

REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.