

ITEM NO.6

COURT NO.8

SLP(Crl. No. 8212/2024  
SECTION II-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 8212/2024

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 28-02-2024 in BA No. 2803/2023 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay)

AFTAB ANWAR SHAIKH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Respondent(s)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.133820/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.133821/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No. 133820/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 133821/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. IA No. 213709/2024-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL, DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

Date : 22-10-2024 The matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN

For Petitioner(s) Ms. Vidhi Pankaj Thaker, Adv.  
Mr. Advait Tamhankar, Adv.  
Mr. Prastut Mahesh Dalvi, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. Anand Dilip Landge, Adv.  
Mr. Aaditya Aniruddha Pande, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

1. In pursuance of an Order passed by this Court on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2024, the petitioner has placed on record various orders passed by the Trial Court. As per the information submitted out of 44 dates

the matter was adjourned as the accused was not produced in Court on 30 occasions. On 8 occasions, the counsel for the petitioner was not present, hence the case had to be adjourned, however, out of these 8 hearings, on 6 occasions, the accused was not produced. On 6 occasions Presiding Officer did not hold the Court.

2. Though, the copy of the aforesaid affidavit was supplied to the counsel for the State on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2024, when the same was filed, however, the counsel for the State does not have any explanation as to why accused was not produced in Court on 30 occasions.

3. Let the Secretary Home, State of Maharashtra file an affidavit as to why Video Conferencing facilities are not being used for production of accused in Court for the purpose of recording of evidence or otherwise? He/she shall also state in the affidavit as to whether such facilities are in place in the State of Maharashtra or not? It shall also be pointed out in the affidavit as to how much of amount was released for installation of Video Conferencing in the Courts and the Jails and what is the present ground situation.

4. In addition, the Registrar General of the High Court shall also file an affidavit with reference to the afore-said facts.

5. Let the affidavit be filed within two weeks.

6. List the matter on 12-11-2024.

(CHANDRESH)  
COURT MASTER (SH)

(VEENA RANI NAGPAL)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)