



IN THE JUDICATURE OF HIGH COURT AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

907 CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 483 OF 2025

RAJENDRA VYANKATRAO PAWAR

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

....

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Sanket N. Suryawanshi

APP for Respondents-State : Mr. S.A. Gaikwad

....

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, JJ.

Dated : 04th April 2025

PER COURT :-

1. The present petition has been filed for following prayers :-

“C] Direct Respondent No.2 Superintendent of Police Jalgaon, to grant immediate police protection to Petitioner and family members and for that purpose issue necessary orders.

D] Direct the Respondent No.3 Amelner Police Station to register offence against unknown persons trying to attack the petitioner and for that purpose issue necessary orders.”

2. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner and learned APP for all the respondents.

3. As regards to prayer clause 'D', in view of the decisions in *Sakiri Vasu Vs. State of U.P. and Others, 2008 (2) SCC 409, Sudhir Bhaskar Tambe Vs. Hemant Yashwant Dhage, 2016 (6) SCC 277 and M. Subramaniam Vs. S. Janaki, 2020 (16) SCC 728*, the petitioner to adopt the proper procedure which should also in consonance with the decision in *Priyanka Srivastava and Another Vs. State of U.P. and Others, 2015 AIR SC 1758*.

4. Under such circumstance, no directions can be given to the police station to register an offence.

5. As regards to prayer clause 'C', learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is ready to bear the necessary charges/statutory charges to the Government for providing him police protection.

6. Upon the submission made by learned Advocate for the petitioner, learned APP, upon instructions from respondent No.2, submits that such application by the petitioner would be positively considered and the police protection can be granted.

7. In view of the said statement, learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner would make an application to

respondent No.2 in proper format and with specifically endorse that he is ready to make the payment within two days.

8. If such application is made, respondent No.2 to consider the case positively as per the instructions given to learned APP.

9. In view of these facts emerging, there is no necessity to keep the Writ Petition pending. It stands disposed off with these directions.

10. Parties to act on authenticated copy.

[SANJAY A. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

asd