



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT INDORE

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRANAY VERMA

ON THE 26th OF SEPTEMBER, 2025

WRIT PETITION No. 38824 of 2025

SANGITA

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....
Appearance:

Shri Zenith Chhablani, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Raghav Shrivastava, learned Govt. Advocate for the
respondents/State.
.....

ORDER

1. By this petition preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India the petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs :-

"(a) Issue a writ, order, or direction in the nature of Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction, directing Respondent No. 6 and all other Respondents to refrain from burning the effigy of the Petitioner's daughter, Mrs. Sonam Raghuwanshi, or undertaking any similar act of public humiliation;

(b) Direct the official Respondents, particularly the State of Madhya Pradesh, the District Collector, the Police Commissioner, and the concerned Station House Officer, to take all necessary preventive measures to ensure that no unlawful or unconstitutional act is carried out against the Petitioner or her family;

(c) Issue a writ, order, or direction directing Respondent No. 6 to cease all publicizing and media campaigns relating to the proposed effigy-burning, including any interviews, pamphlets, or social media postings, which cause mental agony and social



humiliation to the Petitioner and her family;

(d) Pass such further orders or directions as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, to ensure the protection of the fundamental rights of the Petitioner and her family under Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India."

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No.6 is proposing to burn the effigy of petitioner's daughter on the occasion of Vijayadashmi on 02.10.2025 in place of the effigy of Ravana on the pretext of her alleged involvement in a murder incident.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the act of respondent No.6 is against all canons of law and is gross violation of the fundamental rights of the petitioner as well as her daughter and his entire family. Such an act cannot be permitted to take place which shall tarnish the image of the petitioner and his family permanently.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents/State has submitted that due inquiry in the matter shall be made and action in accordance with law would be taken.

5. From the pamphlet and the other documents which have been brought by the petitioner on record it is evident that respondent No.6 proposes to burn effigy of daughter of the petitioner on Vijayadashmi on 02.10.2025 in place of effigy of Ravana. That has been the emphatic statement made by it. In case the same is correct and respondent No.6 intends to do so then the same would be wholly impermissible in a democratic country like India. Even if the daughter of the petitioner is an accused in a criminal case and whatsoever may be the grievance of respondent No.6



against her and her family members it cannot be permitted to resort to such effigy burning which would certainly violate the fundamental rights of the petitioner, her daughter as well as his entire family. Such action on part of respondent No.6 or anyone else cannot be permitted.

6. Thus in the available facts of the case, respondents 1 to 5 are directed to ensure that on the occasion of Vijayadashmi on 02.10.2025 respondent No.6 or any other person or organization does not burn the effigy of petitioner's daughter or any other individual in place of the effigy of Ravana.

7. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed off.

(PRANAY VERMA)
JUDGE