

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE BULDHANA.
{Presided Over by A.G. Santani}

MHBU010002922026



Criminal Bail Application No. 43/2026.

Mayur Sunil Apar.

V/s.

The State : Through PSO, Amdapur.

APPEARANCE :

Mr. Nilesh P. Sawadatkar, Ld. Advocate for the Applicants/Accused.

Mrs. Saoji - Deshpande, Ld. APP for the Non-applicant/the State.

Mr. Akshay G. Totre, Ld. Advocate for the Informant.

ORDER BELOW EXHIBIT NO. 01.

{Passed on 11.03.2026}

01. The applicant/the accused namely Mayur Sunil Apar filed this application for grant of anticipatory bail U/s. 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in Crime No. 40/2026, registered with PS, Dhad, for the offences punishable U/s. 118(1), 296, 115, 352, 351(2) r/w. 3(5), 308(4), 111(1), (2)(b), (3), (4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

02. Briefly, details of the FIR go to show that on 06.02.2205, the informant namely Pawan Rajendra Sonune, lodged report with P.S.Dhad, informing that on that day, at 3.25 p.m. after attending the nature's call, when he was returning to his Medical Shop, one Akshay Jivanlal Bilange (who is arrayed as an accused in this Crime), with Rahul Vijay Dalvi and Roshan Ganesh Shinde, stopped him. They all abused him and demanded 'Hafta' (protection money) for running his shop. Moreover, as he refused, they started slapping on his face and by fists blows. At that time, the said Akshay gave blow of his 'Kada' (just like bangle) on his face and lips. One Purushottam Tukaram Kanher and Laxman Bhiwaji Nagre rescued him from them. Later, the said Akshay and his colleagues left the spot. Further, when he was proceeding to lodge his police report, the said Roshan and one unknown person restrained him and also threatened to face the dire consequences, if he reported the incident. After receipt of this report, the said police station registered the crime and the investigation followed. In

view of this application, now, the applicant prayed his pre-arrest bail, as he is the permanent resident of Dhad. He has no past Criminal record and is falsely implicated in this case. He is not concerned with the said Crime. However, the Officers of P.S., Dhad, visited his house and inquired about his whereabouts. Hence, he is apprehending his arrest in this matter. His name is not recorded in the F.I.R. and no specific role is attributed to him. The recovery is effected and there is no likelihood of his absconding from the investigation. He is ready to abide conditions of the bail. In support of his contentions, he filed photocopies of the FIR, his Aadhar and PAN Card. By filing her reply (Exhibit 05), Ld. APP contended that this applicant was present on the spot and his presence is confirmed in the CCTV Footage. He was in constant touch with the other accused in this Crime. Further, he is the active member of organized crime syndicate, which is headed by the said Akshay. This applicant was accompanied with the said Roshan and he threatened the informant when he was proceeding to lodge the report in this matter. He is also required for interrogation in this matter. Likewise, the informant, by his say (Exhibit 9), denied this application on the count that the applicant committed serious offences. He is habitual offender and if released, he would pressurize the witnesses. Heard Mr. Sawadatkar, Ld. Advocate for the applicant, Mrs. Saoji - Deshpande, Ld. APP for the State, and Mr. Totare, Ld. Advocate for the informant. Perused the Case Diary.

03. Considering their submissions and the record, at the outset, it is worth to be noted that, recitals of the report go to reveal presence and active participation of the said Akshay, Rahul and Roshan in commission of these offences. The Case Diary transpires that during the investigation, the informant was medically examined and the police effected seizure of the vehicle and the cell phones from them. In their police statements, the witnesses -Rajendra Tulshiram Sonune, the said Purushottam and Laxman fortified occurrence of the incident and their role as well. In view of this application, the applicant is praying for his release on bail, **mainly**, on the

grounds that, he was not concerned with this crime and he is being falsely implicated. More so, his name was not mentioned in the police report and no specific role was attributed to him. **True** that the report does not reveal his name. However, the say (Exhibit 05) of the APP reveals that he was in contact with the other accused. **More so**, his presence is confirmed on the spot in view of the CCTV Footage and he is witnessed thereat. That apart, it appears that in view of the Criminal Record of the co-accused, the S.P Office, Buldhana, passed the Order of dtd. 11.02.2026 and, consequently, the offences U/s. 308(4), 111(1),(2)(b),(3),(4) were added against them. In such a scenario, considering the nature of the offences, surely, even the applicant may be required for his interrogation in this Crime. **Notably**, the object of granting anticipatory bail is to safeguard the personal liberty of the individual and to protect him from the possibility of being humiliated and unnecessarily harassed by police by taking him in custody. However, a delicate balance is required to be established between a right of personal liberty of an individual apprehending his arrest and the Societal interest. For this proposition, a reliance may be put on the case of P. Chidambaram Vs. Directorate of Enforcement, (AIR 2019 SC 4198). On this backdrop, I am not inclined to release this applicant on his pre-arrest bail. Hence, the Order:

-: ORDER :-

01. Criminal Bail Application No. 43/2026 stands rejected.
02. The proceeding is, accordingly, disposed of.

Buldhana.
Dated : 11.03.2026.

{A.G. Santani}
Addl. Sessions Judge, Buldhana.
District : Buldhana.

Certificate

I affirm that the contents of this order are same word for word as per original.

Name of Court	Additional Sessions Judge, Buldhana.
Name of Steno	Sanjay Chaudhari (Steno Grade I)
Pronounced on	11/03/2026
Upload Date	12/03/2026