

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

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.723 OF 2025**

Eknath Shankar Jambhulkar ...Appellant  
V/s.  
The State of Maharashtra and Anr. ...Respondents

**WITH  
CRIMINAL APPEAL (ST) NO.16210 OF 2025**

Navnath Shankar Jambhulkar ...Appellant  
V/s.  
The State of Maharashtra and Anr. ...Respondents

**WITH  
CRIMINAL APPEAL (ST) NO.18512 OF 2025**

Rohit Jambhulkar ...Appellant  
V/s.  
The State of Maharashtra and Anr. ...Respondents

Mr. Mithilesh Mishra a/w. Yuvraj Patil	Advocate for Appellants in all Cr.Appeals.
Mr.Ashok S. Gawai:-	APP for Respondent No.1 -State in Cr.Appeal No.723 of 2025.
Mr.H.J.Dedhia:-	APP for Respondent No.1 -State in Cr.Appeal (ST) No.16210-2025.
Mr.Karan Singh Rajput i/b. Mr.Aadesh Konde Deshmukh:-	Advocate for Respondent No.2 in both Cr.Appeals.
API Santosh Jadhav present in both matters.	Lonavla City Police Station, Pune.

**CORAM : S.M. MODAK, J**

**DATE : 30<sup>th</sup> September 2025.**

**P.C. :**

Heard learned Advocate for the respective Appellants, learned APP and learned Advocate Rajput for Respondent No.2-first informant.

2. It is true their anticipatory bail applications were rejected by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Vadgaon, Maval. It is true that Appellant-Eknath and Navnath were granted ad-interim protection after hearing both the sides. The interim-relief granted by the trial Court was continued. The interim relief was not to arrest those respective appellants until certain date.

3. Whereas Appellant -Rohit has filed the appeal subsequently and the trial Court as per the order dated 25<sup>th</sup> June 2025 has directed the police not to arrest him until certain period. There is a request to continue that protection on behalf of Appellant-Rohit.

4. The charge-sheet is already filed by the police. Submission on behalf of all the sides is they have seized one mobile which contain the recording of the entire incident and it was done by one witness. Learned Advocate Rajput in his affidavit-in-reply has annexed certain photographs from that mobile record. Learned Advocate for the Appellants want to rely upon one photograph in order to

challenge the allegations of using weapon by Appellant-Rohit. Whereas, according to Mr. Rajput the Appellant-Rohit has snatched away that weapon and then assaulted.

5. There is also FIR registered at the instance of the Appellant-Navnath. He claims that it relates to the incident that has taken place on the same date, time and place. Even he claims that the charge-sheet is filed.

6. It is the submission of Mr. Rajput that while rejecting the anticipatory bail application of all the applicants, the learned Additional Sessions Judge Vadgaon, Maval viewed the mobile recording and that is referred in the impugned order. It is the submission of Mr. Rajput that those observations were referred by Justice Laddha while granting anticipatory bail to his clients.

7. It seems that both the sides want to lay emphasis on recording the said mobile though for different reasons. So it will be relevant to see the photographs which can be taken from the mobile recording. It is with the police. Hence, liberty granted to police to place on record photographs from the contents of the pendrive.

8. In view of the above facts, the Appellant-Rohit can also be granted interim protection. The submission of Mr. Rajput is he is also likely to abscond. So instead of continuing the interim protection, there will be direction to give attendance to furnish surety. In view of that following order is passed:

**ORDER**

- (i) In case of arrest in connection with C.R. No. 179/2025 the Appellant-Rohit be granted bail on furnishing Personal Bond and Surety Bond of Rs.25,000/-.
- (ii) He is directed to give attendance to the concerned Police Station on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2025 and 7<sup>th</sup> October 2025 from 10.00 a.m. to 12.00 noon until further orders.
- (iii) He is directed not to threaten the prosecution witnesses. He is directed not leave the limits of Pune district.

9. So in view of that let the similar directions be given for Appellant-Eknath and Appellant-Navnath. Hence, the following order:

**ORDER**

- (i) Let Appellants - Eknath and Navnath be also released on bail on furnishing Personal Bond and Surety Bond of Rs.25,000/- each.
- (ii) They are directed to give attendance to the concerned Police Station on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2025 and 7<sup>th</sup> October

2025 from 10.00 a.m. to 12.00 noon until further orders.

(iii) They are directed not to threaten the prosecution witnesses. They are directed not leave the limits of Pune district.

10. Stand over to **15<sup>th</sup> October 2025**.

11. The Appellants are at liberty to file rejoinder in the office. It is made clear that just because ad-interim protection of such nature is granted, it does not mean that Court has expressed any view about merits of the case.

**(S.M. MODAK, J.)**