Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO._____ OF 2017

DISTRICT: MUMBAI

In the matter of provisions contained under Article 227 of The Constitution of India, 1950

And

In the matter under Section 482 and 483 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

1. SUNIL BAGHEL

s/o C.B. SINGH BAGHEL,

Age: 42 years,

Occupation: Journalist

Address: A-45/202, Sector 3,

Shanti Nagar, Mira Road (East).

2. NEETA KOLHATKAR

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

Age: 50 years,

Occupation: Journalist

Address: Jagannath Niwas, 2nd floor,

AwantikabaiGokhale Cross Lane, Mumbai.

3. VIDYA KUMAR

Age: 40 years,

Occupation: JOURNALIST

Address: 604, 23D, Sneh CHS,

Bimbisar Nagar,

Goregaon (East), Mumbai.

4. SHARMEEN HAKIM INDOREWALA

Age: 26 years,

Occupation: Journalist

Address: 36/37, 4th Floor,

Lucky Building, 16, Pakmodia Street,

Mumbai.

5. SADAF MODAK

Age: 28 years,

Occupation: Journalist

Address: 103, Mudit Gardens,

Sector 12/A, Plot: 17/1,

Koparkhairane, Navi Mumbai.

6. SIDHARTH BHATIA

Age: 61 years,

Occupation: Journalist

Address: 21, Prem Court, J Tata Road,

Churchgate Reclamation, Mumbai.

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

7. NARESH JOSEPH FERNANDES

Age: 48 years,

Occupation: Journalist

Address: Chez Nous, 125, St Cyril Road,

Bandra (West), Mumbai

8. SUNILKUMAR M SINGH

Age: 48 years,

Occupation: Journalist

Address: Flat No. 14, 5th Floor,

Janardan Apartment, Somwar Bazar,

Malad (West), Mumbai.

9. REBECCA SAMERVEL

Age: 34 years,

Occupation: Journalist

Address: A 504, Vastu Park,

Evershine Nagar,

Malad (W), Mumbai **.....PETITIONERS**

Versus

1. THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA
2. CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
   Special Crime Branch,
   Mumbai.
3. Mukesh Kumar Parmar (Original accused no 4)
   S/o LaljibhaiParmar
   Occupation: Then Dy Superintendent of Police,
   ATS, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

Address: D-1/5, Officer's Quarters,

Opp. Police Head Quarters,

ShahiBaug, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Village: Anawada, Tehsil-Pattan,

District Patan, Gujarat

4. NarsinhDabhi (Original accused no 5)

S/o HarisinhDabhi

Occupation: Then Police Inspector,

ATS, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Address: 2/3, Police Officer's Flats,

Hira Baug, Ellis Bridge,

Ahmedabad Gujarat

Village Nagnesh, Tehsil Chuda,

District Surendra Nagar, Gujarat

5. BalkrishanChaubey (Original accused no 6)

S/o RajendraprasadChaubey

Occupation: The then Police Sub-Inspector,

ATS, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Address: House No. 126/1,

"CH" Type, Sector-20, Govt Quarters,

Gandhinagar, Village Gram/Post,

Lassipur, Taluka Jahanaguni,

District Azamgarh, UP

6. Rehman Abdul (Original accused no 7)

S/o Rasheed Khan

Occupation: The then inspector of police/SHO.

P.S. Pratapnagar, Udaipur

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

Add.: Government quarters,

Pratap Nagar, Udaipur

345, Jalpura, Jaipur Rajasthan

7. Himanshu Singh Rawat (Original Accused no 8)

S/o Mohan Singhji Rao

Occupation: The then Police Sub Inspector / SHO,

Khanoda P.S., Udaipur

Add: 10-B, Adarsh Nagar, University Road,

Udaipur, Rajasthan

Village 5, Anand Bhavan,

Temple Road, Bhitwari, Dist: Pali, Rajasthan

8. Shyam Singh Charan (Original Accused no 9)

S/o Late Jai Singh

Occupation: The then Police Sub-Inspector,

Jawar Mines P. S. Udaipur Rajasthan

Add.: Residing at P.S.: Sahira,

District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

9. Ajay Kumar Parmar (Original Accused no 10)

S/o Bagwan Das

Occupation: The then Police Constable,

ATS, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Address: 3-Anand Vihar Society,

Opp. Rohit Park, Danilinada,

Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Village Sollaiya, Taluka - Mansa,

District Gandhinagar, Gujarat

10. Santram Sharma (Original Accused no 11)

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

S/o Chandrabhan Sharma

Occupation: The then Police Constable,

ATS, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Address: Quarter No. 10/4,

Type-VI, Sector 28,

Gandhinagar, Gujarat

Village/Post-Naraina, Taluka-Samalka Mandi,

District Panipat, Haryana

11. Naresh Chauhan (Original Accused no 9)

S/o Vishnubhai Chauhan

Occupation The then Sub-Inspector of police,

ATS, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Address: C-27, Kamdhenu Society,

Ranip, Ahmedabad Gujarat

12. Vijay Kumar Rathod (Original Accused no 14)

S/o ArjunbhaiRathod

Occupation: The then Police Inspector ATS,

Ahmedabad, Gujarat

Address: Udit Apartments,

Tulip Bungalows, Opp. TV Tower,

Thaltej, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

13. Rajendra Kumar Jirawala (Original Accused no 19)

S/o LaxmandasJirawala

Occupation: Property Developer and Real Estate Agent

O/Address: Jirawala Construction,

10 New Cloth Market,

Raipur, Ahmedabad

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

Address: 20-B, SthanakWasi,

Jain Society, Near Naranpura Crossing,

Ahmedabad

14. GhattamaneniSrinivasa Rao (Original Accused no 23)

S/o Murali Krishna

Occupation: The Then Police Sub-Inspector,

Singaraykonda PS., Singaraykonda,

Dist – Prakasam, Andhra Pradesh

Now Police Inspector,

Addanki Circle, Dist- Prakasam,

Andhra Pradesh.

15. Vipul Aggarwal (Original Accused no 24)

S/o Shital Aggarwal

Occupation: The Then Superintendent of Police,

Banaskantha, Gujarat

Address: E-03, Dy. SP bungalow,

Police Head Quarters, Palanpur, Gujarat

&

C-21, Ashok Vihar, Phase-1, New Delhi

16. Aashish Pandya (Original Accused no 25)

S/o Arunkumar Pandya

Occupation: the then Police Sub-Inspector,

SOG, Palanpur, Gujarat

Address: Quarter No. D2, Police Headquarter,

Palanpur, Gujarat

&

Village - Meghpar, Taluka- Bhuj,

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

Dist. Kutch, Gujarat

17. Narayan Singh (Original Accused no 26)

S/o Fateh Singh Chauhan

Occupation: The then Assistant Sub-Inspector,

Dist. Police Udaipur, Rajasthan.

Address: Village - Utharda,

Tehsil - Nathdwara,

Dist. Rajsamand, Rajasthan

18. Yuvdhvir Singh (Original Accused no 27)

S/o Nathu Singh Chauhan

Occupation: The then Police Constable,

Dist. Police, Udaipur, Rajashtan

Address: HiranMagri, police station,

Udaipur, Rajashtan

Village - Jalalpur, Tehsil- Bawal,

Dist. Rewari, Haryana

19. Kartar Singh (Original Accused no 29)

S/o YadramJat

Occupation: the then Police Constable,

Dist. Police, Udaipur, Rajasthan

Address: HiranMagri police station,

Udaipur, Rajasthan

Village - Majrakath, Tehsil- Bharor,

Dist – Alwar, Rajasthan.

20. Jethusinh Solanki (Original Accused no 30)

S/o Mohansinh Solanki

Occupation: the then Assistant Sub-Inspector of police,

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

SOG, Palanpur, Gujarat

Address: Village Mota,

Taluka - Palanpur,

Dist – Banaskantha, Gujarat

21. Kanjibhai Kutchi (Original Accused no 31)

S/o Naranbhai Kutchi

Occupation: the then Police Constable,

SOG, Palanpur, Gujarat

Address: Quarter No. 332,

Block No. B-28, Police Headquarter,

Palanpur, Gujarat

At & Post - Village Vasi, Taluka - Santa,

Dist – Banaskantha, Gujarat

22. Vinod Kumar Limbachiya (Original Accused no 32)

S/o AmrutlalLimbachiya

Occupation: The Then Police Constable,

SOG, Palanpur, Gujarat

Address: Quarter No. 283, Block No. B-24,

police headquarters, Palanpur, Gujarat

& At & Post: Village Dangiya,

Taluka- Dantivada,

Dist – Banaskantha, Gujarat

23. Kiransinh Chauhan (Original Accused no 33)

S/o Halaji Chauhan

Occupation: The then Constable, SOG,

Palanpur, Gujarat

Address: Chamunda Society,

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

Behind Police Headquarters,

Madhupura road, Palanpur,Gujarat

& Village - Madna (Dangia),

Taluka-Palanpur,

Dist. Banaskantha, Gujarat

24. Karan SinhSisodia (Original Accused no 34)

S/o ArjunsinhSisodia

Occ - the then Police Head Constable Driver,

SOG, Palanpur, Gujarat

Add - Village - Hadad, Taluka - Danta

25. Ramanbhai Patel (Original Accused no 38)

S/o Kodarbhai Patel

Occupation: the then Dy. Superintendent of Police,

CID Crime, Ahmedabad

(presently posted as Dy S.P,

Sarkhej division, Ahmedabad Rural,

Ahmedabad)

Address: 6-Raghukul Bungalows,

Opp. Gulab Tower, Sola, Ahmedabad**.....RESPONDENTS**

TO,

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE OF

THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF

BOMBAY AND OTHER HON'BLE

PUISNE JUDGES

HUMBLE PETITION OF THE

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

PETITIONERS ABOVE NAMED.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:

Brief Statement of the Case:

1. The present Writ Petition is being filed under article 227 of the Constitution of India read with section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 against the Judgment and Order dated 29th November, 2017 ("**Impugned Order**"), passed by the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mumbai, in Sessions Cases No. 177 of 2013, 178 of 2013, 577 of 2013 and 312 of 2014, by virtue of which allby virtue of which allthe Print, Electronic and Social media reporting has been directed not to publish information pertaining to the proceedings during the trialof the said matter, i.e. the case of murder of one Sohrabuddin, his wife Kausar Bi and their associate TulsiramPrajapati. Wherein the Accused persons are the police personnel of the State of Gujarat, Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh.

Parties:

2. The Petitioners are citizens of India residing at the respective addresses mentioned in clause title above. The Petitioners are representatives of various nationally and internationally recognized and accredited Media/ Press/ Publication Agencies and houses. They are journalists who are working with different News organizations across print, electronic and web media. Being part of News Organizations, it forms a part of the Petitioners' ardent duties to disseminate information

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

to the public about happenings inside Court rooms as well as the World outside and at large. Petitioner No. 1 has been working as a journalist for over 17 years, with Legal reporting experience of over 13 years and is currently associated with a Mumbai based Newspaper. Petitioner No.2 has been working as a journalist for over 27 years and is currently the City-head of a National Daily. Petitioner No. 3 has been working as journalist for over 15 years, with Legal reporting experience of around 8 years and is currently associated with a National News Channel. Petitioner 4 has been working as a journalist for over 5 years and is currently associated with a Mumbai based Newspaper. Petitioner No. 5 has been working as a journalist for over 5 years and is currently associated with a National Newspaper. Petitioner No. 6 has been working as a journalist for 40 years and is a Founder Editor of a News Web portal. Petitioner No. 7 has been working as a journalist for 27 years and is also a Founder Editor of a News Web portal. Petitioner No. 8 has been a journalist for over 24 years and is currently associated with a National News Channel. Petitioner no. 9 has been working as a journalist for about 8 years and is currently associated with a National Newspaper. Some of the Petitioners have been associated with Legal reporting for over a decade, and have covered various trials without any allegations of misreporting, including, but not limited to, both the legs of the serial Bombay Bomb Blasts case of 1993, the terror attack case of November 2008 where Pakistani

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

National AjmalAamir Qasab was arrested and awarded death sentence, the serial train blasts case of 2006 etc.

3. The Respondent No. 1 is the State of Maharashtra. The Respondent No. 2 is the investigating/prosecuting agency in the above mentioned cases. The Respondent Nos. 3 to 25 are the Accused in the said case facing the trial before the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mumbai. The said Impugned Order has been passed on an application made by the Respondents.

Facts:

4. The facts and circumstances giving rise to the filing of the present Writ Petition are as under:

a. The cases listed as Sessions Case nos. 177 of 2013, 178 of 2013, 577 of 2013 and 312 of 2014 before the Learned Additional Sessions judge, Mumbai are cases of murders of one Sohrabuddin Sheikh, his wife Kausar Bi and their associate TulsiramPrajapati. Originally the ATS Ahmedabad Unit had registered a case against Sohrabuddin Sheikh's in November 2005 under sections 120B, 121, 121A, 122, 123, 307, 186, 254 of the IPC r/w section 25(1) of the Arms Act. On a petition filed by the deceased's brother Rubabuddin Sheikh, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, by an order dated 12th January, 2010, transferred the investigation of the said case to the Central Bureau of Investigation. After which the agency registered the case as RCBS1/2010/S/0004-MUM. Pursuant to this, the investigating agency filed the first charge sheet on 23rd July, 2010. Subsequently, on an

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

appeal filed by the Central Bureau of Investigation, on the 27th September, 2012, the Hon'ble Supreme Court transferred the case to a court in Mumbai. It is the case of the prosecution that between 2004 to 2006 the accused entered into a criminal conspiracy to nab and kill one Sohrabuddin Sheikh, who was an accused in several cases of murder, abductions, extortion, carrying firearms, etc. pending in various courts of State of Gujarat and State of Rajasthan. Sohrabuddin Sheikh was killed, allegedly in a fake encounter in the morning of 26th November 2005. It is further alleged that after about 3 days of killing Sohrabuddin Sheikh, his wife Kausar Bi was also killed by police and her dead body was burnt and disposed of. After about one year there from, on 27th December 2006, TulsiramPrajapati was also allegedly shot dead by Gujarat and Rajasthan police in a stage-managed encounter near SarhadChapri on border of State of Gujarat and Rajasthan. The three cases have been clubbed vide Supreme Court order dated 8th April 2013 and are being conducted as one single trial by the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mumbai i.e. Special Central Bureau of Investigation Judge. Out of the original 38 accused in the cases, 15 accused have been discharged and the trial is being conducted against 23 accused. The Petitioners crave leave to refer to the papers and proceedings of the said case as and when required by this Hon'ble Court.

b. On 29th November, 2017, Respondent No. 6 (Original Accused No. 7) filed an application (marked as Exhibit 1502

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

by the Learned Trial Court) before the Learned Trial Court seeking a gagging order barring any media reporting of the proceedings before the Trial Court. The application was supported by Respondents No. 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24. Hereto annexed and marked as **Exh. "A"** is a copy of the said application dated 29th November, 2017.

c. It was under these circumstances that the Impugned Order was passed by the Trial Court on 29th November, 2017. By virtue of the Impugned Order, the Petitioners, and indeed all members of the press/media, are barred from reporting the proceedings of the said case. Hereto annexed and marked as **Exh. "B"** is a copy ofJudgment and Order dated 29th November, 2017, passed by the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mumbai, in Sessions Case No. 177 of 2013, 178 of 2013, 577 of 2013 and 312 of 2014.

d. The said case has been pending in the Special Central Bureau of Investigation Court in Mumbai for the past five years and has already been extensively reported in the press/media. Petitioners crave leave to refer to various News reports across section of the Newspaper/Media/Web portals of the said case which have appeared from time to time.

e. It is the contention of the Petitioners that, the order which has been passed, is directly against the Petitioners. Therefore, they are moving this Hon'ble Court, by means of the captioned Writ Petition seeking appropriate relief, to set aside the said illegal order.

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

f. It is the contention of the Petitioners that, they represent various News Organizations and it is their duty, part of their work ethics, nature of employment and occupation to disseminate information to the public, about happenings inside the Court rooms as well as outside.

g. It is the contention of the Petitioners that, the said Impugned Order has resulted in acting like a major road block and obstacle for them, in discharging the duties they are bound to, by virtue of their profession and occupation. It is further contended that, it is the sacred duty of the Petitioners to bring out and publish impartial news, happenings and chain of events, which is an extremely essential and an indispensable part of a democratic step up, like that of ours.

h. It is the contention of the Petitioners that, on account of the said Impugned Order, an injunction has been granted, restraining the press from publishing/disseminating information through their Newspapers /Channels /Web portals, the events and even the accurate reporting of what transpires in Court proceedings, which are generally open to the public. In this regard, it is necessary to note that by virtue of the said Impugned Order, the Petitioners and all others who are associated with the press, are prohibited from reporting the events and happenings in the said court. This virtually amounts to gagging the press and passing an order of injunction against them.

i. It is the contention of the Petitioners that, the Impugned Order was passed on the 29th November, 2017.

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

j. The Petitioners applied for a certified copy of the said order and the application on which the order was passed on 14th December, 2017. The certified copy of the Impugned Orderwas received by the Petitioners on 18th December, 2017. As such, this petition is not vitiated by delay or laches of any kind.

k. In the light of the aforesaid, being aggrieved by the Judgment and Order dated 29th November, 2017, passed by the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mumbai, in Sessions Case No. 177 of 2013, 178 of 2013, 577 of 2013 and 312 of 2014,that the Petitioners are approaching this Hon'ble Court, by virtue of the captioned Writ Petition, to set aside the said order on the following among other grounds, without prejudice to one another:

G R O U N D S

A) The Impugned Order is illegal and is not tenable in law.

B) The Impugned Order is bad in law and liable to be quashed and set aside.

C) The Impugned Order violates the principles of an open trial contained in Section 327 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and is contrary to the said provision.

D) The Learned Trial Court ought to have considered that the application which was filed by Respondent No. 6 and supported by Respondents No. 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24, pursuant to which the Impugned Order was passed, was completely devoid of any material particulars. The said Respondents failed to identify any

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

dangers to a free and fair trial that would result from any media reporting of the trial proceedings.

E) The Learned Trial Court has no powers to gag the media/press from reporting the proceedings of the trial if the trial is otherwise not held in-camera. Even otherwise, the Learned Trial Court ought to have considered that it does not have any inherent powers to order any in camera trial or to pass any gagging order, since the trial court is neither the High Court nor a Civil Court.

F) The Learned Trial Court ought to have considered that the said case involves an element of public interest, and our populace therefore has the right to know what transpires in the trial. In the said case, the accused, almost all of whom are former police officers, are standing trial on the charges that they engaged in fake “encounter” killings in and around Gujarat. As such, this is a very serious trial with a large element of public interest, and the people have a right to know what transpires in the said trial.

G) The Learned Trial Court in the Impugned Order has failed to articulate what the “exceptional circumstances” were which necessitated the passing of such a drastic gagging order against the press/media, restraining the press/media from reporting the proceedings of the trial.

H) The order passed by the Learned Additional Sessions Judge is beyond his jurisdiction and powers. There is no provision under the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973,

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

authorizing the Learned Judge to pass the said order. Consequently, the said order is illegal and deserves to be set aside.

I) The Impugned Order fails to realize that the said case has already been extensively reported in the press and has received extensive media coverage. There is, thus, now nothing to be gained by barring the media from reporting the proceedings of the trial. Further, there has been no security threat to any of the accused or their advocates or to anyone else as a consequence of the media reporting so far.

J) The Impugned Order is an illegal order which operates on a day-to-day basis in a manner which is prejudicial to the functioning of the Press.

K) The Learned Trial Court failed to consider that the said case has already been extensively reported in the press and has received extensive media coverage. There is, thus, now nothing to be gained by barring the media from reporting the proceedings of the trial. Further, there has been no security threat to any of the accused or their advocates or to anyone else as a consequence of the media reporting thus far.

L) The Impugned Order is far too broad. The Learned Trial Court ought to have not ordered a blanket ban on all media reporting of the trial court proceedings in their entirety.

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

M) The Learned Trial Court trial court ought to have considered that all media persons / newspaper reporters cannot be painted with the same brush. The mere possibility that some journalist may perhaps carry out some irresponsible reporting of the trial does not mean that all other newspapers/media must be gagged from reporting the proceedings altogether. In any case, there is an alternate remedy to take appropriate action against any irresponsible/negligent journalists for contempt of court for misreporting proceedings.

N) The Learned Trial Court erred in passing the Impugned Order simply based on a mere 'apprehension' of an untoward incident. While these apprehensions can be addressed, infringement of fundamental right of the Petitioners' Freedom of Speech and Expression cannot be remedied, except by quashing the said order.

O) The Learned Trial Court ought to have considered that, the apprehension of the Applicants in Exhibit 1502, on which the Impugned Order by the Learned Additional Sessions Judge was passed, about likelihood of an untoward incident because of News reports related to the death of a former Judge associated with this case is unfounded as News reports on the death of the former Judge, must be read in a holistic manner.

P) The Petitioner will suffer irreparable loss and injury and hardship, which cannot be compensated in terms of money, if the Impugned Order is not set aside at the

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

earliest. Whereas no harm will be caused to the Respondents. Until the Impugned Order is set aside, and is still operative, the Petitioners would be aggrieved and suffering each day.

Q) It ought to be considered that, it is in the interest of justice and proper adjudication of the law, the Impugned Order ought to be quashed and set aside at the earliest.

R) It ought to be considered that, if the Impugned Order is not set aside, it will set a bad example and work as a judicial precedent for other Courts and will thus, further amount to recurring grave injustice and illegalities.

S) In any event, the Impugned Order is bad in law, unreasonable, illegal and deserves to be quashed and set aside.

T) There is no other alternate and efficacious remedy to the Petitioner than to file the present Writ Petition.

U) The Petitioner is approaching this Hon'ble Court as early as possible and without any delay and/or laches.

V) The Petitioner craves leave to add, alter, amend, delete any of the foregoing paragraphs or grounds as and when found necessary with the permission of this Court.

W) The Petitioner states that he has not filed any other petition, revision or appeal etc. either in this Hon'ble Court or in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India touching the subject matter of the present Writ Petition.

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

X) The Petitioners crave leave to refer to such other and further documents as this Hon'ble court may deem fit and appropriate.

Y) **It is therefore prayed that:**

(a) This Hon'ble Court may be pleased to call for the records and proceedings of Sessions Case nos. 177 of 2013, 178 of 2013, 577 of 2013 and 312 of 2014 pending on the file of the Special Central Bureau of Investigation Judge, Mumbai, and after perusing the same, quash and set aside the Impugned Order dated 29th November, 2017, passed by the Learned Additional Sessions Judge presiding over the Special Central Bureau of Investigation Court in the application (marked as Exhibit 1502) in the aforesaid cases, entirely;

(b) Pending the hearing and final disposal of the captioned Writ Petition, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to stay/suspend the operation and effect of the Impugned Order dated 29th November, 2017, passed by the Learned Additional Sessions Judge presiding over the Special Central Bureau of Investigation Court in in the application (marked as Exhibit 1502) in Sessions Case nos. 177 of 2013, 178 of 2013, 577 of 2013 and 312 of 2014;

Bar & Bench (www.barandbench.com)

(c) Interim and ad-interim reliefs in terms of the above prayer clauses;

(d) Costs of the present Petition.

(e) Pass such other and further reliefs as the nature and circumstances of the case may require.

AND FOR SUCH ACTS OF KINDNESS, THE PETITIONER SHALL DUTY BOUND EVER PRAY.

Mumbai

Dated: Advocate for the Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I, SUNIL BAGHEL s/o C.B. SINGH BAGHEL, age – 42 years, Occ.: Journalist, the Petitioner, for myself and on behalf of the other Petitioners, herein above named, do here by declare on solemn affirmation that what is stated in the foregoing paragraphs no. ___and ___ of the Criminal Writ Petition is true to my knowledge and belief and I believe the same.

SOLEMLY AFFIRMED AT MUMBAI

ON THIS ___ DAY OF _____ 2017

Identified, explained and interpreted by DEPONENT

ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER