



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1198 OF 2026**

Shaam Vilas Sakat ... Applicant

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra ... Respondent

Ms. Ekta Patil i/b Mr. Prashant Hagare, for the Applicant.

Ms. Poonam Bhosale, APP for the Respondent – State.

CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.

DATE : 5th May 2026.

P.C. :

1. By the present Application, the Applicant has sought pre-arrest bail in anticipation of arrest in FIR No. 85 of 2026 registered with Baramati Police Station, Tal. Baramati, Dist. Pune, for offences punishable under Sections 109, 115(2), 3(5), 351(2), 351(3), 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and under Sections 4 and 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

2. On 05.03.2026, an FIR was registered by Baramati City Police Station upon receipt of a complaint from the Informant. The prosecution case is that Pramod Kekane (uncle of the Informant) manages the hotel business, namely 'Lokpriya', at Indapur Square,



Baramati. A dispute arose over the hotel bill between a person and a hotel employee. When the Informant tried to intervene in the said argument, the Informant was abused and assaulted with sickles, resulting in grievous hurt to the Informant.

3. There are three accused in the present crime.

4. Ms. Ekta Patil, learned Advocate for the Applicant, submits that the Applicant is not named in the FIR filed by the Informant. She submits that the Applicant was implicated in the crime based on the Informant's description of the assailants as being aged 20 to 22 years. She submits that no injury was caused to the Informant.

5. Ms. Poonam Bhosale, learned APP for the State, submits that the Informant was assaulted with a dangerous weapon, namely a sickle. She submits that the FIR names the Applicant as Accused No. 1 and the other two accused. She further submits that the Applicant's role in the FIR is that of an assailant.

6. The Informant is assaulted with a dangerous weapon, i.e. a sickle, resulting in grievous hurt. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegation and the Applicant being assigned an active role in the crime, a prima facie case is made out against the



Applicant.

7. Another aspect that needs to be noted is that the Applicant has three criminal antecedents, viz. Crime No. 833 of 2023 under Section 154 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and the Prevention of Children from Sexual Offences Act; Crime No. 22 of 2023 for offence under the the Indian Penal Code, 1860; and Crime No. 714 of 2019 for the offence of unlawful assembly with a sharp weapon and under Section 324 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Sharad Sehgal v. State of U.P.*¹ held in paragraph no. 6 that criminal antecedents themselves are sufficient to deny Anticipatory Bail.

9. No indulgence is warranted in this Application.

10. In view of the above, Anticipatory Bail Application No. 1198 of 2026 is rejected.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

1 *2026 SCC OnLine SC 740*