

MHCC020066762026



IN THE SPECIAL COURT FOR PROTECTION OF CHILDREN FROM
SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT, 2012, AT FORT GR. BOMBAY

BAIL APPLICATION POCSO NO. 415 OF 2026
IN
REMAND APPLICATION NO. 600 OF 2026

Jitendra Dadarao Navnit
Versus

... Applicant/Accused

The State of Maharashtra,
(Through Worli Police Station, Mumbai)

... Respondent

Appearance :-

Ld. Advocate Mr. Vikas B. Arsul for applicant/accused.

Ld. Special Public Prosecutor Mrs. Pranjali Joshi for Respondent.

Ld. Advocate Mr. Sankalan Das for Intervenor.

CORAM :- HER HONOUR JUDGE,
A. S. WAIRAGADE,
The Designated Court under
Protection of Children from
Sexual Offences Act, 2012.
(COURT ROOM NO.33)

DATE :- 12th June, 2026

(O R D E R)

(Dictated and pronounced in the open Court)

1. The applicant/accused has preferred this application under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (B.N.S.S.)

for releasing him on bail. It is submitted on behalf of the applicant/accused that applicant/accused came to be arrested in Crime No.175 of 2026 registered with Worli Police Station, Mumbai for the offences punishable under Sections 74 and 75 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita read with Section 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offence Act, 2012.

2. Heard learned Advocate Mr. Vikas B. Argul for applicant/accused. Perused the say of I.O. vide Exhibit-02, heard learned Ld. Special Public Prosecutor Mrs. Pranjali Joshi for Respondent/State and Ld. Advocate Mr. Sankalan Das for Intervenor. Also perused the say of Victim vide Exhibit-03.

3. It is submitted on behalf of the applicant/accused that the applicant/accused is innocent and falsely implicated in the present crime and has not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. The applicant/accused is working as Assistant Commissioner Police and is attached to Technical Department on the verge of retirement and is permanent resident of Nagpur. The applicant/accused is in Judicial Custody and his physical custody for interrogation and investigation purpose is no more required. The applicant/accused is the sole earning member of his family. The offences levelled against the applicant/accused are not punishable with life imprisonment or death penalty. The applicant/accused is ready to co-operative with the investigation and there is no possibility of him being absconding. The applicant/accused is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions of bail. Hence, considering this fact, the applicant/accused prayed for releasing him on bail.

4. The prosecution filed say below Exhibit-02 and resisted the bail application on the ground that the applicant/accused being a police officer has committed this serious offence with a minor girl. The gravity of offence is aggravated by the act of accused. If the applicant/accused is enlarged on bail, there is a possibility that he would take disadvantage of his position as police officer and might pressurized the prosecution witnesses and evade trial. Considering these facts the prosecution prayed for rejecting the bail application of applicant/accused.

5. The victim filed her say below Exhibit-03 and strongly objected for enlarging the applicant/accused on bail in the same line as that of prosecution.

6. Perused the application and documents filed the record. It reveals that report is given by the father of victim alleging that victim aged 9 years old is his daughter and when she had gone for plying alongwith other siblings on 23-04-2026, the accused committed the incident as alleged in the report. In the present matter the victim child is just 9 years old and has no reason to falsely implicate the accused. The accused in the present crime is a police officer of high ranking and is having not just the knowledge about the offence, but the implications thereof. The complicity of accused can be gathered from the papers on record. The investigation is at preliminary stage and therefore I do not think it proper to enlarge the applicant/accused on bail. Hence, the following order :-

ORDER

- 1) **Bail Application POCSO No. 415 of 2026 stands rejected and disposed off accordingly.**

2) Inform the applicant/accused via Jail Authority.

Date: 12/06/2026
Mumbai.

(A. S. Wairagade)
Designated Special Judge
under POCSO Act,
City Civil & Sessions Court, Gr. Mumbai.

Dictated on : 12.06.2026
Signed by HHJ on : 12.06.2026

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL SIGNED JUDGMENT/ORDER”

12.06.2026, 04:50 p.m.
UPLOAD DATE AND TIME

(Mr. Jitesh S. Shinde)
NAME OF STENOGRAPHER

Name of the Judge (with Court room no.)	HHJ A. S. Wairagade, C.R. No.33.
Date of Pronouncement of JUDGMENT/ORDER	12-06-2026
JUDGMENT/ORDER signed by P.O. on	12-06-2026
JUDGMENT/ORDER uploaded on	12-06-2026