

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3052 OF 2024**

Umakant Maharaj Khadeshwar	...	Applicant
vs.		
The State of Maharashtra and another	...	Respondents

Mr. Kuldeep S. Patil a/w. Mr. Nagesh Khedkar and Mr. Nikhil Hire for applicant.

Ms. Rutuja Anil Ambekar, APP for respondent No.1-State.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE, J.
DATE : 18th NOVEMBER, 2024**

P.C. :

. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the respondent No.1-State.

2. The applicant is apprehending arrest in connection with FIR No.0397 of 2023 dated 29.10.2023, registered at Yeola City Police Station, District Nashik Rural, for offences under Sections 354 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC). Subsequently, offence under Section 376 of the IPC was also added.

3. The statement of the informant describes in graphic detail the activities of the applicant which led to registration of FIR. It is stated that the applicant claims to be a *maharaj*, who, under the pretext of treating the informant, indulged in such activities, which led to registration of offences against him.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant sought to demonstrate the inconsistency in the stand taken by the informant, as at one place, she has stated that her brother had recorded the act on his mobile phone, while at another place, it is stated that her husband had recorded the act, while her brother was present. It is submitted that the applicant is a 65-year old person and ready to co-operate with the investigation and therefore, this Court may consider allowing the present application.

5. The learned APP has vehemently opposed the present application, relying upon the statement of the informant and the seriousness of the offences registered against the applicant.

6. This Court has perused the statement of the informant. Undoubtedly, it describes the incident in graphic detail and the manner in which the applicant allegedly threatened the informant and forced himself upon her. The question as to whether the act was recorded by the brother or the husband of the informant in the mobile phone, would not be of much significance, considering the statement of the informant, which also indicates why there was some delay in registration of FIR.

7. No case is made out for granting anticipatory bail. The application is dismissed.

(MANISH PITALE, J)