IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 580 OF 2024

XYZ Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and others Respondents

...
Mr. Sambhaji S. Tope, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. G.A. Kulkarni, A.P.P. for respondents-State.
...

CORAM : SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE AND
VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV, JJ.

DATED : 30 October 2026

Order (Per Sandipkumar C. More, J.) :

1. Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith. Heard finally with the consent of rival parties.

2. By way of this petition the petitioner, who is the original complainant, is seeking direction for re-investigation of Crime No.41/2023 dated 15.02.2023 registered with Mondha Police Station, District Parbhani through C.I.D.

3. On hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, it appears that the petitioner is seeking re-investigation mainly on the ground that girls Aarti Rodge and Rupali Rodge were in fact having certain objectionable photographs of the petitioner with

the accused and the accused, by pressurising the petitioner to disclose those photographs, molested her, and therefore, crime has been registered.

4. On the contrary, learned A.P.P. submits that the Investigating Officer, during the investigation, searched for those girls Aarti Rodge and Rupali Rodge, but no existence of those girls was found. On the contrary, even the accused Vishal Patil, on interrogation, submitted that no such girls by name Aarti and Rupali Rodge are in existence. Even otherwise also, if the F.I.R. is perused, then it reveals that the names of those girls were taken by the petitioner by contending that the accused had in fact told her that her photographs were with those girls. Thus, the existence of those girls is in doubt and even after thorough investigation, such existence of those girls could not be found.

5. Admittedly, charge-sheet is already filed in this crime and sessions case arising out of the same is pending before the Sessions Judge, Parbhani. In view of the same, we are not inclined to issue any direction for such re-investigation as claimed by the petitioner. It is to be noted that the another petition for quashing F.I.R. and charge-sheet is already removed from the board of this Court for to be presented before the learned single Judge for further consideration.

6. Under such circumstances, no substance is found in the present petition and it stands dismissed.

7. Rule is discharged.

(VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV)
JUDGE

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE)
JUDGE