



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

950 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1031 OF 2024

Hayat Khan Wahed Khan

....Applicant

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & another

.....Respondents

.....

Mr. N. R. Shaikh, Advocate for Applicant.

Mrs. M. L. Sangeet, APP for the State.

CORAM : R. M. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 3rd OCTOBER, 2024.

PER COURT :

1. Applicant apprehends arrest in connection with Crime No. 0091/2024 registered with Savda Police Station, District Jalgaon, for the offences punishable under Sections 143, 147, 149, 392, 354, 427 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. First informant reported the incident occurred on 17.05.2024 at about 8.15 pm. According to her, when she was taking a walk along with her neighbour, 4 persons including the present Applicant were seen running towards them. They were followed by many other persons. It is alleged that the Applicant and three other persons were causing damage to the vehicles. It is

further stated by the informant that said four persons came near to her and they snatched the gold chain from her neck. Thereafter they ran away.

3. Learned counsel for Applicant submits that three reports are registered in respect of the same incident. According to him, in the report lodged by police personnel, there is no mention about such incident being occurred as alleged by the present informant. Similarly, he drew attention of the Court to the First Information Report bearing Crime No. 93/2024 being lodged on 21.05.2024. It is his submission that there are no specific allegations that the Applicant has snatched the gold chain of the informant from her neck. It is his further submission that the Applicant has no criminal history behind him. He claims to have attended the police station after getting interim protection from this Court.

4. Learned APP opposed the Application by contending that the report lodged by the informant herein is first in time and the report claims to have been lodged by way of counter blast. It is her statement that the supplementary statement of the informant so also

statement recorded under Section 164 of Code of Criminal Procedure corroborate her version in the First Information Report.

5. Even if statement of informant in the First Information Report is accepted to be true, it was not specific as to who had actually snatched the chain. In the supplementary statement, however, the said act has been attributed to the co-accused and not to the present Applicant. As such, nothing is to be recovered from the present Applicant. He has attended the police station. There is no grievance made by the Investigating Agency that he has not cooperated in the investigation. Hence, Application stands allowed in terms of the interim order.

(R. M. JOSHI)
Judge

dyb

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

950 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1040 OF 2024

Shaikh Irfan Shaikh QutuboddinApplicant

VERSUS

The State of MaharashtraRespondent

.....

Mrs. A. N. Ansari, Advocate for Applicant.

Mrs. M. L. Sangeet, APP for the State.

CORAM : R. M. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 3rd OCTOBER, 2024.

PER COURT :

1. After hearing learned counsel for both the sides, when this Court has expressed disinclination to allow the Application, learned counsel for the Applicant, on instruction seeks withdrawal of the Application.

2. Application is dismissed as withdrawn.

(R. M. JOSHI)
Judge

dyb