



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

966 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1113 OF 2024

1. Lucky @ Laxman Bhika Jadhav
2. Shankar Rangnath Jadhav
3. Ramdas a/s Bhavka Kalu Jadhav .. Applicants

VERSUS

- . The State of Maharashtra .. Respondent

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Vinod Y. Bhide

APP for Respondent/State: Mr. B. B. Bhise

Advocate for Assist to PP : Mr. K. N. Shermal

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 26th NOVEMBER, 2024

PER COURT:

1. Heard.
2. The applicants are seeking anticipatory bail in connection with Crime No.0136 of 2024, dated 22.02.2024, registered with Akole Police Station, Akole, District Ahmednagar for the offence punishable under Sections 143, 148, 149, 427, 436, 506 of IPC and the applicants no.2 and 3 are granted interim protection by order of this court dated 19.07.2024.
3. The learned APP points out that there is evidence indicating that the applicants are involved in the offence. There are statements of the minor girl, so also, there is statement of one Laxmibai as having seen the applicants breaking into the house and also destroying the property

and that they are running away from the house. There is also prior enmity. Applicants are related to the girl who is a minor and was with the informant at the relevant time. The custody of the minor girl was taken by the parents of the minor girl and POCSO offence is also registered against the son of the informant on 26.02.2024. In the instant case, the incident is of 21.02.2024 and the same is registered on 22.02.2024.

4. The learned counsel for the applicants submits that this a false case registered to stop the probable FIR under POCSO Act. The learned counsel also submits that the victim was not with the complainant on the relevant date and she has not given the statement to the police. However, the police papers indicate that the statement of the girl is made to the police authority.

5. Prima facie, the applicants are connected with the offence as reflected from statement of witnesses. The offence is serious. The prosecution has produced photographs, which shows that there is destruction of the property, so also, the house was burnt. In view of the same, this would not be a fit case for grant anticipatory bail.

6. The applicants are permitted to withdraw the amount deposited before the trial court to show their bonafides.

7. The Anticipatory Bail Application stands dismissed.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.]

marathe