

RCC No.573/2002
State Vs. Sanjay Agrawal and
Ors.
Exh.No.1051
CNR No.MHWR030003432002

Order below Exh.1051
(dt.23.07.2026)

Perused application and say filed by the prosecution. Heard both the counsel. The accused No.1 filed this application for grant of permission to appear through video conferencing wherein he has submitted that the accused no.1 is simultaneously facing multiple criminal trials which are pending before Court at different cities therefore it is impossible for the accused no.1 to be present before all court on the same or overlapping dates.

2) The accused no.1 relied on the citation of the Hon'ble High Court of judicature at Rajasthan ***Vikram Singh Indori and others Vs. State of Rajasthan and others***, wherein the Hon'ble High Court held that it is not feasible for the accused to the physically present at multiple location simultaneously. In the event of simultaneous proceedings, his physical absence leads to be adjournments, thereby causing unnecessary delay. It has also been noticed that, in accordance with Section 273 of the Criminal Procedure Code, there exists no legal impediment if the accused is represented by his counsel and accused no.1 requested to this court that he may be permitted to appearing through video conferencing. He has mentioned in application about the detail rules governing the conduct of video conferencing have been notifying being the Hon'ble High court of Bombay Rules video conferencing for the Court 2022, published in the Maharashtra Government Gazette and operating from 29.12.2024. From the above mentioned contents the Rule of video conferencing, the accused is very well known how to

apply and request the Court to appear before Court through video conferencing but at the same time he forgot to produce, the schedule mentioned by the Hon'ble Bombay High Court No.Rule/P/1603/2022/06 dt.04.01.2023. Wherein the facility given to the litigant to appear before the court through video conferencing but there is a responsible given in Schedule – II request form for video conferencing which is not attached with this application. Under such circumstances, it appears that, accused is very well known about the rule. But at the same time, he forgot to comply with the rules of video conferencing. Therefore, this application is filed only to extend dates to prolong the matter. Hence, application is liable to be rejected, therefore I pass the following order -

ORDER

Application is rejected.

Place:-Wardha

Date:- 23.07.2026.

(Smt.M.Y.Doiphode)
Chief Judicial Magistrate
Wardha.