



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1321 OF 2026
IN
CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2269 OF 2024

Anil Babulal Chokhara ...Applicant
Versus
The inspector of police and Anr ...Respondents

Mr. Sujit Sahoo a/w Zainab Burmawala for the Applicant
Mr. Arfat Sait, APP for the Respondent-State.

CORAM: R. M. JOSHI, J.

DATED: 06th May, 2026

PC:-

1. This application has been filed for modification of condition no. (iv) and (vi) of the order dated 10.03.2025.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that since the applicant is attending the hearing before the Trial Court regularly, There is propriety in continuing condition No. (iv) of the said order. It is his further submission that the passport of the applicant has already been seized and the applicant be



asked to seek permission from the Trial Court only he wishes to leave India. After one year of the passing of the order, condition no (vi) is not required to be continued any more. It is his further submission that more particularly in view of order dated 24.03.2026 passed by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh in Criminal Petition No 1238 of 2026, the applicant would be required to appear before the investigating agency once in a week i.e. on every Sunday only until further orders. It is his submission that in such case Trial Court would be burdened with the proceeding.

3. Learned APP opposed the application.

4. In so far as the condition No. (iv) is concerned since the applicant is attending proceedings before the Trial Court, the Condition No. (iv) there is no propriety in continuing the said condition any more.

5. In so far as the condition no. (iv) is concerned, needless to say that such conditions are not imposed by the Court routinely and therefore the condition is so imposed, there is presumption that the Court has after application of its mind



thought it appropriate to impose such condition.

6. This Court put a query to the learned counsel for the applicant as to the number of occasions on which he was required to go out of Maharashtra in last one year. On instructions, he makes statement that, it was only once. It is clearly indicated that no inconvenience whatsoever being caused to the applicant with imposition of condition no. (vi). As far as the order of the Andhra Pradesh High Court dated 24.03.2026 is concerned, irrespective of the said order, it would be necessary for the applicant to seek permission of the Trial Court. Needless to say that on the basis of the said order, there would not be any impediment for the Trial Court to permit the applicant to visit the investigating agency as per the said order.

7. Hence, application stand partly allowed in the above terms.

R. M. JOSHI, J.