



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

993 CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.3690 OF 2025

Bunty Alias Dipak Suresh Khopde And Others

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Another

...

Advocate for Applicants : Ms. Deshmukh Naseembanu Iliyas

APP for Respondents : Mr. A. M. Phule

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

Dated : November 21, 2025

PER COURT :-

1. Present application has been filed for quashing the FIR vide Crime no.138 of 2025 registered with Chalisgaon road Police Station, Tq. and District Dhule for the offences punishable under sections 74, 76, 310(2), 189(2), 191(2), 352, 351 (2), 3(5) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023
2. No necessity to issue notice to respondent no.2.
3. It has been submitted on behalf of the applicants that the FIR is vague. The informant has not given full names of the accused, who had committed offences against her. The incident is stated to have taken place around 12.30 noon on 20.6.2025 on the road. Yet the offence came to be registered on 1.7.2025. There is an unexplained delay in lodging the FIR. Further, there might have been gathering of people which

would have gathered at the place, still nothing has been revealed. It appears that FIR has been lodged with ulterior motive.

4. First and foremost fact that is required to be noted is that, as per the informant, when she was walking on the road, five persons came in a four wheeler vehicle and then, they had started using off-seen language and gestures also and, thereafter, she has also stated that some of them have done such act with her person which amounts to outraging of her modesty, but then, she has also stated that people had gathered and it was shown to her that who were two persons amongst those five persons. In those matters in which the informant has no knowledge about names of accused, still the offence can be registered against unknown accused persons. Identity can be established later. When the act is attributed and such incident like outraging of modesty that has taken place in the broad-day light requires investigation, we are of the opinion that this is not a fit case where we should exercise our powers under section 528 of the BNSS. The application stands **rejected** at the threshold.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.) (SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.)