

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) NO. 22 OF 2013

NASEER G. MOHAMMAD AND OTHERS Appellant(s)

Versus

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA Respondent(s)

W I T H

WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) NO. 143 OF 2013

RAIES AHMAD DAULAT PATEL AND OTHERS Appellant(s)

Versus

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER Respondent(s)

O R D E R

1. These writ petitions have been filed pointing out alleged communal attacks on Muslims at Dhule, Maharashtra, which took place on 6.1.2013. It is alleged that in those attacks, police officials

themselves have participated and indulged in indiscriminate firing, which resulted in death of six youths and injuries to more than fifty persons. It is further stated in the writ petitions that no independent inquiry was held and even the First Information Report was not registered. For this purpose, the remedy which was sought in these writ petitions, is to establish a Special Investigation Team (SIT) from the policemen outside the State of Maharashtra to investigate the incident and also direct prosecution against the erring officials.

2. During the pendency of these writ petitions, the State Government appointed Mr. Justice K.U. Chandiwal, a retired Judge of the Bombay High Court, to conduct judicial inquiry into the said incident. We are informed that the said retired Judge has already completed the inquiry and even submitted the Report on 29.11.2016.

3. We expect the State Government to take into consideration the said report and act accordingly. In case the report indicts some police officials, we also expect the State Government to initiate appropriate

criminal proceedings/departmental action, as the case may be, against them.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners, at this stage, that it is not sure as to whether the Inquiry Commission had given hearing to all those persons who were attacked and wanted a hearing. We would not like to go into that aspect at this stage.

5. If any issue requires consideration, the petitioners shall be at liberty to take up the same before the appropriate forum.

6. Copy of the Report shall be given to the learned counsel for the petitioners.

7. Needless to mention that if the petitioners have any grievance about the said Report, it will be open for them to file appropriate applications(s) in this behalf.

8. The writ petitions are disposed of with the above observations.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[ABHAY MANOHAR SAPRE]

New Delhi,
December 06, 2016.

ITEM NO.15

COURT NO.9

SECTION X

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

Writ Petition(s) (Criminal) No(s). 22/2013

NASEER G. MOHAMMAD & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Respondent(s)

(with office report)
(For final disposal)

WITH

W.P.(Cr1.) No. 143/2013

(With Office Report)

Date : 06/12/2016 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. SIKRI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ABHAY MANOHAR SAPRE

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Colin Gonsalves, Sr.Adv.

Mr. Ali Qambar Zaidi, Adv.

Ms. Jyoti Mendiratta, Adv.

Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, Adv.

For Ms. Aparna Bhat, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Sushil Karanjkar, Adv.

For Mr. Nishant Ramakantrao Katneshwarkar, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

These writ petitions are disposed of in terms of the
signed order.

[MALA KUMARI SHARMA]
COURT MASTER

[SUKHBIR PAUL KAUR]
A.R.-CUM-P.S.

(Signed order is placed on the file)