

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 325 OF 2025

Chandrakant Raghunath Jadhav
and Ors.

...Appellants

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

...Respondents

ALONGWITH
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 335 OF 2025

Arvind Raghunath Jadhav
and Ors.

...Appellants

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

...Respondents

ALONGWITH
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 336 OF 2025

Dipak Rangnath More

...Appellant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

...Respondents

ALONGWITH
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 363 OF 2025

Satish Ramrao Deshmane
and Anr.

...Appellants

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

...Respondents

Abhijit Patil	Advocate for the Appellant in Cri. Appeal No. 325 of 2025
Deepti Thorat	Advocate for Appellant in Criminal Appeal No. 336 of 2025
Dhananjay Thoke	Advocate for Appellant in Criminal Appeal No. 335 of 2025
Shilpa K. Gajre	APP for the Respondent-State in Sr. No. 35
Adv. Lisa Das, Adv. Vivek Yadav i/by Jay and Co.	Advocate for the Appellants in Cri. Appeal No. 363 of 2025
Adv. Hrishikesh P. Giri a/w Dyaneshwar Kale	Advocate for the Respondent No. 2 in all appeals
PSI Machindra Kolhe	Pimpalgaon Police Station

CORAM : S. M. MODAK, J.

DATE : 11th SEPTEMBER 2025

P.C. :-

1. Heard learned Advocate for the Appellants, learned Advocate for the first informant and learned APP.
2. There is already interim protection from the arrest. Police are investigating the offence. Charge-sheet is not yet filed. The incident

has arisen during demolition of certain structures. The first informant case is during the demolition drive, these Appellants have entered into structure and demolished it forcibly. That is how the offence.

3. It is case of the first informant that the video recording was done and certain photographs are taken. The prosecution has filed an affidavit, so also the first informant. On page no. 73, the affidavit by the prosecution, there is mention of 29 videos and 10 photographs.

4. On the basis of the instructions, learned APP pointed out that one pen drive is seized by drawing panchnama. It is submitted by learned Advocate for the first informant that recording was done and pen drive is handed over to the investigating agency.

5. The Appellants are disputing the allegations made by them in the manner mentioned in the F.I.R.. Even there is submission that the video recording does not justify the allegations as stated in the F.I.R.. There is request for grant of liberty to view these videos. It is submitted, on earlier date, this Court (Coram:- N. R. Borkar, J.) has given oral direction to the prosecution to show those videos to the Appellants. It is disputed on behalf of the first informant.

6. Learned APP Ms. Gajare if she wants to confirm this fact from

learned APPs who have appeared on the earlier dates; but it is nobody's case that there was written direction. In view of the dispute and in the absence of the written direction, this Court cannot direct the investigating agency to show those videos to the Appellants.

7. No doubt the Court can view these videos. Prior to that it is for the first informant and the investigating agency to inform the Court what are the contents of those videos. On this background, they are at liberty to take appropriate steps.

8. Ad-interim relief granted earlier to continue till the next date.

9. Stand over to 07th October 2025.

[S. M. MODAK, J.]