

MHRG170004072026



IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE ,
PANVEL-RAIGAD
ORDER BELOW EXH.01 IN CRI. BAIL APPLN. NO.200/2026

1. **Santosh Ramkrishna Kattiman**
Age-47 yrs., Occu. Business,
R/at- A-701, Raj Vansh Heights,
Sector-3, Kharghar, Navi Mumbai
410210.
2. **Dhananjay Dharamdev Prajapati**
Age-28 yrs., Occu. Business,
R/at-A-12, Kamraj Nagar, SM Road,
Antop Hill Church, Mumbai-400037. **...APPLICANTS**

Verses.

The State of Maharashtra,
Through Kharhgar Police Station. **...RESPONDENT**

The learned advocate for applicants : Mr. Rahul Mishra
The learned A.P.P. for State : Mr. A. S. Thakur
The learned advocate for informant : Mr. Santosh Khopade

(DICTATED AND PRONOUNCED IN OPEN COURT)
ORDER BELOW EXH.1

1. By this application, the applicants have made an attempt to seek anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS in C.

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.

R. No.481/2025 registered with Kharghar Police Station, Navi Mumbai for the offences punishable under Sections 318, 316, 351, 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Learned advocate Mr. Rahul Mishra for the applicants has submitted that after the previous bail application was rejected, the applicants have produced vehicle in question before the Investigation Officer and therefore there is change in circumstances warranting exercise of discretion in favour of the applicants. Thus, he has prayed for grant of pre-arrest bail.
3. Per contra, learned A.P.P. Mr. A. S. Thakur for the State has submitted that the Investigation Officer had submitted the TTO forms to the RTO and that it is revealed that there is variance in the signatures appearing on TTO Forms and therefore it is necessary to have custodial interrogation with the applicants.
4. He would further submit that this court has already considered the contentions raised by the petitioners in the previous bail application and that the application was decided on merit. Thus, he would submit that there is no change in circumstances for considering the bail application, on the contrary the material collected by the investigation officer has aggravated the nature of crime.

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.

Thus, it is prayed for rejection of the application.

5. Learned advocate Mr. Santosh Khopade for the informant has adopted the submissions advanced by learned APP.
6. In the light of the submission advanced before me, I have gone through the copy of order passed by this Court in Bail Application No.48/2026. After considering the submissions of both the sides this Court had made following observations;

“If the allegations levelled against the applicants are taken into consideration in that case there would be no hesitation to hold that allegations are serious in nature. In order to arrive at proper conclusion, in my view opportunity of custodial interrogation of the applicants to the Investigation Officer needs to be granted. Therefore, I hold that no case is made out by the applicants for grant of pre-arrest bail.”

7. Upon perusal of the aforesaid part of the earlier order, even by stretch of imagination, it does not reveal that this Court had observed that since the vehicle in question were required to be seized the application needs to be rejected. In fact, in the aforesaid order this Court has categorically considered serious nature of the allegations made against the applicants and after considering the pros and cons of the matter, this Court had concluded that an opportunity

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.

of custodial interrogation to the Investigation Officer needs to be granted.

8. In addition to this, in the light of the material collected by the investigation officer, it can be said that the nature of crime is likely to be aggravated, as the Investigation Officer had collected material that there was difference in the signatures appearing on the TTO Form.
9. In the light of this I am of the firm view that no case is made out for grant of pre-arrest bail. Accordingly, the application fails.
10. Before parting to pass the final order it is necessary to observe that despite, this Court has specifically made observation holding that the applicants are not entitled for pre-arrest bail, the applicants have again approached this Court and wasted valuable time of this Court. In my view such practice needs to be deprecated, by imposing costs upon the applicants. Hence, I proceed to pass following order;

:: ORDER ::

- 1) The application is hereby rejected on cost of Rs.10,000/- which shall be credited to the Legal Services Authority.
- 2) If the applicant do not deposit the amount of cost within 15 days from the date, appropriate steps be taken for

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Pavel-Raigad.

recovery of the amount.

3) Inform to concern Police Station.

(Dictated and Pronounced in open Court.)

Place : Panvel.

Date : 25/03/2026

(Dinesh E. Kothalikar)

**Additional Sessions Judge, Court No.2,
Panvel Dist. Raigad.**

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.