



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

922 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1061 OF 2024

Lakhan Ashok Lagad

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and another

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Murkute J.M.

APP for Respondent No.1: Mrs. M.L. Sangit

Advocate for Respondent No.2 : Mr. S.R. Sapkal

.....

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.

DATED : 29th AUGUST, 2024.

PER COURT :-

1. The applicant apprehends arrest in connection with crime No.185 of 2024 registered with Khultabad Police Station, district Aurangabad, for the offences punishable under Sections 354, 354-D, 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 12 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

2. It is the prosecution's case that the informant had acquaintance with the applicant and on that count the applicant would call the informant on mobile and he told the informant that he want to marry with her. The informant refused his proposal. It is alleged that thereafter, the applicant would stop the informant and threaten her that if she did not perform marriage with him, he will kill her. It is alleged that on 24.5.2024, when only the informant was present in

her house, around 6.30 p.m. the applicant came there. By seeing him, the informant closed the door. It is alleged that the applicant kicked on the door and threatened the informant that if she did not marry with him, he will kill her and thereafter ran away from the spot of incident.

3. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant and the informant are relatives. The marriage was fixed between them. Thereafter, due to dispute, the false complaint is lodged against the applicant. The applicant is student. If he is arrested his career would be spoiled. Hence, requested to allow the application.

4. It is the contention of the learned APP alongwith learned counsel for respondent No.2 that no marriage was fixed between the applicant and the informant. The applicant would harass the informant for performing the marriage with him. Considering the allegations against the applicant, his custodial interrogation is required and requested to reject the application.

5. I have heard all the learned counsel. Perused the F.I.R. and the police papers produced on record. The allegations against the applicant is that he used to harass the informant. On the day of

incident, when the informant was present in the house and she had closed the door, it was the applicant, who kicked on the door of the informant and threatened her. Considering the allegations against the applicant and the fact that he is a student and taking education, his custodial interrogation is not required and I pass the following order:-

ORDER

- (i) The application is allowed.

- (ii) The interim anticipatory bail granted to the applicant vide order dated 01.07.2024 stands confirmed on the same terms and conditions with following modifications.
 - (a) the applicant shall not contact the informant or her family members.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)

rlj/