

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 459 OF 2026

1. Seema Zia Alam Sayed
2. Sayed Zia Sayed Mahe Alam ...Applicants

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. Viral K. Rathod, a/w Ms. Shivani Shinde, i/b Mr. Vishwatej Jadhav, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. S. R. Shinde, 'B' Panel Counsel for the Respondent/State.

Adv. M. Solkar a/w Mohd. Juned & Nawaz Dordi, Advocate for the Intervener/Orig. Complainant.

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : 06.03.2026.

P.C. :

1. This is an application for Anticipatory Bail.
2. The applicants are apprehending their arrest in Crime No. 94 of 2026 registered at Nirmal Nagar Police Station, for the offences punishable under Sections 118(1), 115(2), 352, 351(2) & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
3. According to the prosecution, on the date of the incident, which took place on 08.02.2026 at around 12.30 pm, a

dispute arose between the applicants and the first informant on account of some house property and other domestic issues. It is alleged that during the said dispute, the present applicants threw boiling water on the person of first informant and her two daughters, due to which they sustained serious burn injuries.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant, the learned APP for the respondent-State and the learned counsel for the first informant.

5. The learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants and the first informant are relatives. It is submitted that accidentally the boiling water fell on the person of first informant and her daughters. However due to the property dispute, false allegations are made against the present applicants. It is further submitted that though initially no allegations were made against the daughters of the applicants in the first information report, subsequently they are also falsely implicated in the present crime. It is submitted that there is no need of custodial interrogation and the applicants are ready and willing to cooperate in the investigation. It is further submitted that there are no other

criminal antecedents against the applicants. The learned counsel for the applicants, on instructions, submits that the applicants to avoid any further dispute are ready to stay outside the jurisdiction of Nirmal Nagar Police Station.

6. On the other hand, the learned APP for the respondent-State and the learned counsel for the first informant submit that the applicants are involved in a serious crime. It is submitted that the first informant and her daughters sustained serious burn injuries. It is submitted that there are independent eye witnesses to the incident. It is submitted that considering the nature of crime the applicants may not be released on anticipatory bail.

7. I have perused the first information report. There appears to be a property dispute between the parties. It appears that initially in the FIR no allegations were made against the daughters of the present applicants. Subsequently, they also came to be roped in the crime in question. *Prima-facie* the intent of the first informant appears to be to involve the entire family of the applicants. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to release the applicant on anticipatory bail. In the result, the following order is passed :

ORDER

- a) The Application is allowed.
- b) In the event of arrest of the applicants in connection with Crime No. 94 of 2026 registered at Nirmal Nagar Police Station, for the offences punishable under Sections 118(1), 115(2), 352, 351(2) & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, they shall be released on bail on furnishing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- each with one or two sureties in the like amount.
- c) Till the conclusion of trial, the applicants shall not enter into the jurisdiction of Nirmal Nagar Police Station except to attend the concerned police station, if called, for the purpose of investigation.

[N.R.BORKAR, J.]