

MHGA010002902026



IN THE COURT OF ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE, GADCHIROLI

(Presided over by Shri Pravin V Chatur)

Special (SC/ST) Case No. 46/2026

State of Maharashtra through
P.S.O. of Police Station, Ashti
District : Gadchiroli.

.. *Prosecution*

-Versus-

Mohd. Shahid Mohd. Faruk Ansari
Aged 20 years, Occ. : Labour,
R/o. Chhapara, Dist- Mujafarpur (Bihar)
At present R/o Umari,
Tah. Chamorshi, District : Gadchiroli.

.. *Accused*

O R D E R (Below Exh.05)

(Passed on : July 17, 2026)

1] This is an application seeking the release of the accused on his personal bond.

2] It is submitted that Bail Application No. 69/2026 of the accused was allowed by an order dated 07.05.2026, wherein he was directed to be released on a Personal Bond (PB.) and a Surety Bond (S.B.) of Rs. 25,000/-. However, he has been unable to arrange for a surety. Hence, this application.

3] The learned APP opposed the application, submitting that the accused has already been granted bail, that the offence is of a serious nature, and that the accused hails from a state other than

Maharashtra. Hence, the learned APP prayed for the rejection of the application.

4] The victim appeared and submitted her reply at Exh. 6. She reiterated the allegations contained in the FIR and prayed to reject the application.

5] I have heard the learned advocate for the applicant/accused and the learned APP for the State.

6] The applicant/accused was granted bail by an order dated 07.05.2026 in Criminal Bail Application No. 69/2026. All grounds regarding the merits of bail have already been dealt with while passing the order in the said application. Now, it remains to be seen whether the applicant/accused can be released on a personal bond or not.

7] The learned APP submitted that the applicant/accused hails from another state, namely Bihar, and therefore, he may not return to attend the court proceedings.

8] Considering the allegations in the FIR, the continued incarceration of the applicant/accused behind bars was not found necessary. Now, he has approached with the submission that he could not arrange for a surety, and therefore, prays for his release on a Personal Recognizance (P.R.) bond. Merely because the applicant/accused hails from another state, it cannot be deemed sufficient to presume that he will abscond from court proceedings. On the other hand, the learned advocate for the applicant/accused submitted that since the accused is behind bars, he has been unable to arrange a surety, and if he is released on a P.R. bond, he will be in a position to do so.

9] The offence registered against the applicant/ accused is punishable with imprisonment not exceeding 03 years. The learned advocate for the applicant/accused further submitted that upon his temporary release on a P.R. bond, the applicant/accused will be able to furnish a solvent surety, which requires physical contact with relatives and others—a task that is only possible if he is released. The submissions made by the learned advocate for the applicant/accused are sufficient to release him on a P.R. bond for a period of 30 days to facilitate the arrangement of a surety. Hence, I pass the following order:

ORDER

1. Application (Exh.05) is hereby allowed.
2. The applicant/accused be released on his Personal Bond as per bail order and shall furnished surety within 30 days.

Gadchiroli.
July 17, 2026.

(Pravin V. Chatur)
Addl. Sessions Judge,
Gadchiroli.