

MHST190003002026



IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, WAI
Criminal Bail Application No.99 of 2026

Popat Jaysing Kharat & Anr.

..Applicant

V/s.

State of Maharashtra

..Respondent

Mr. A. D. Yadav, Advocate for the applicant.

Coram: Mr. S. R. Tamboli,
I/c.The Addl. Sessions Judge, Wai,

:: ORDER BELOW EXH. 4 ::

01] In the present application, the applicants have sought ad-interim anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

02] In brief, the case of the prosecution, as per the FIR, is that Dilip Narayan Dhone, the informant, was serving as a Senior Platoon Commander in the Taluka Commandant Office, Home Guard. Popat Kharat and Bhimrao Thombare were working as Home Guards. They had filed complaints against the informant. They were raising a dispute on the ground that he was not allowing them to perform duty. On 25.05.2026, he received orders from the higher office for making arrangements of Home Guards for the purpose of Bakri Eid. Accordingly, he made arrangements of Home Guards. Thereafter, on 26.05.2026 at about 12:00 p.m., when the informant was

(Page No.1)

working in the office, Amar Sul and Dattatray Barakade were present on duty. At that time, accused Popat and Bhimrao came there. They told Amar Sul and Dattatray Barakade to leave the office. The informant told Amar to record a video on a mobile phone. Accordingly, he recorded the incident on the mobile. At that time, both accused sought an explanation for issuance notice to them. When the informant was about to leave the office, Popat slapped him. Amar caught hold of Popat, at that time Bhimrao abused and threatened him. Both accused obstructed him in discharge of his public duty.

03] In the backdrop of these facts, Mr. A. D. Yadav, learned counsel for the applicant, submitted that there was a dispute between the applicants and the informant. The applicants have exaggerated the incident. There is no prima facie case against the applicants. There is an apprehension of arrest. Hence, he prayed that ad-interim anticipatory bail be granted to the applicants.

04] The FIR, prima facie, shows that the applicants had anger against the informant on account of being called upon to submit their explanation on WhatsApp. Their act is recorded in a video. Hence, it prima facie appears that there was obstruction to public duty. Hence, this is not a fit case to grant ad-interim anticipatory bail to the applicants. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following order:

ORDER

Application (Exh. 4) is rejected.

Date- 05/06/2026

(S.R.Tamboli)
I/c. Addl. Sessions Judge, Wai