

**IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE (FIRST CLASS),
36th COURT, MUMBAI CENTRAL RAILWAY, MUMBAI.**

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 519 OF 2025

IN

**C.R. NO. 614/2025 OF THE MUMBAI CENTRAL RAILWAY POLICE
STATION, MUMBAI.**

Vinodkumar s/o Kashinath Sahu

.... Applicant/Accused

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra

Through Mumbai Central

Railway Police Station, Mumbai.

.... Respondent.

Appearance :- Shri. Kiran Rane, Ld. Advocate for the
Applicant/accused.

Smt. S. A. Kupwade, Ld. A. P. P. for the
Respondent-State.

**ORDER PASSED BELOW BAIL APPLICATION
(Passed on 26th November, 2025)**

This is an application for bail moved by the accused under section 480 of the BNSS in connection with C. R. No. 614/2025 registered in the Mumbai Central Railway police station for the offence punishable under section 303 (2) of the BNS.

2. Read the application. It is contended on behalf of the accused that the investigation is utmost completed. So also, nothing is to be carried out against the accused. The accused is an innocent person. The allegations levelled against him are false and baseless. The accused is a permanent resident of Mumbai. There is no likelihood of absconding or tampering with the evidence. Hence, it is prayed to release the accused on bail. Accordingly, the say of Ld. A.P.P. and I.O. was called. They have filed their say and objected the application on the grounds that the accused is an habitual offender. There are 06 serious offences of the similar nature have been registered against the accused. So also, if the accused is released on bail, he would again commit the same kind of offences. Moreover, if he is released on bail, his presence would

not be secured. On these various grounds, the prosecution has resisted the present application.

3. I have heard the Ld. Advocate Shri Kiran Rane for the accused. I have also gone through the remand papers. It *prima facie* appears from the record that the accused is an habitual offender. Hence, if the accused is enlarged on bail, he would again indulge himself in the same kind of offences. In addition to this allegedly stolen muddemal properties i.e. the informant's golden chain weighing 10 gms and cash amount of Rs. 6000/- have been seized at the instance of the accused. Thus, it transpires that there is direct and *prima facie* evidence against the accused. Furthermore, the prosecution has an apprehension that the accused would tamper the prosecution evidence by interfering in the on going investigation. In the present case, the investigation is in progress and still at preliminary stage. In such circumstances, having regard to the criminal antecedents of the accused, I am of the view that the accused is not entitled to be enlarged on bail. Hence, in result thereof, I pass the following order :-

ORDER

1. The Bail Application No. 519 of 2025 is rejected and disposed of.
2. Office to inform to the accused immediately. Issue letter to the Jail Authority accordingly.

sd/-

(Tushar B. Waje)

Judicial Magistrate (First Class),

Date :- 26.11.2025.

36th Court, Mumbai Central Railway, Mumbai.

Alam