

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1145 OF 2021

Akshay Sopan Jadhav

.... Applicant

versus

State of Maharashtra

.... Respondent

.....

- Mr.Vaiibhav R. Gaikwad, Advocate for Applicant.
- Mr.S.R. Agarkar, APP for the State/Respondent.

CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.

DATE : 19th MAY, 2021

(through video conferencing)

P.C. :

1. The Applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in connection with C.R.No.31/2021 registered with Waduj Police Station, Satara, under sections 353, 504 of the Indian Penal Code.
2. The FIR is lodged by Police Constable Mr.Yogesh Dattatray Suryawanshi, attached to Waduj police station, on 23/01/2021. The FIR is lodged at 02.24 a.m. on 24/01/2021 and the statement shows that it was given on 23/01/2021.

3. Heard Mr.Vaiibhav R. Gaikwad, learned counsel for the Applicant and Mr.S.R. Agarkar, learned APP for the State.
4. The first informant in his FIR has stated that he was on traffic control duty at Mayani outpost. On 23/01/2021 at about 07.00 p.m. he was on duty. At that time, the Applicant approached him and started quarreling with him. He told the informant that he had seen the informant recording a video about the Applicant riding motorcycle near medical college road. The informant tried to make him see reason. But the Applicant did not listen. He snatched the machine, which was with the informant. The machine was used for the offence of traffic violation. The Applicant snatched the machine and threw it on the ground. He abused the informant and went away. On this basis, FIR is lodged.
5. Learned counsel for the Applicant submitted that, for these allegations, custodial interrogation of the Applicant is not necessary. He submitted that there is nothing to show that the

machine was broken. He further submitted that the Applicant is falsely implicated.

6. Learned APP opposed this application. He submitted that the allegations are serious and such instances should not be tolerated. One more offence vide C.R.No.434/2020 u/s 353 is already pending against the present Applicant.

7. I have considered these submissions. The Applicant has similar antecedent. There is no reason to doubt the version of the first informant in the FIR. Submission that the machine was not broken is hardly of any substance. The allegations are that the Applicant snatched machine and threw it on the ground. Such tendency of the Applicant shows that he has no respect for law enforcement agency. Such instances cannot be tolerated. Therefore the Applicant cannot be protected by an order of anticipatory bail. Application is rejected.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)