



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

22 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 66 OF 2025

VINOD BHUJANGRAO PAWAR

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Bhagure Pralhad Chagan

APP for Respondents-State : Mr. Ruchir S. Wani

Advocate for respondent No.2 : Adv. A. S. Jadhav
(appointed)

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 27.01.2025

P.C. :

1] Heard learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the respondent-State.

2] The applicant is apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No. 577 of 2024 dated 25.12.2024, registered at Ambad Police Station, Tq. Ambad, District Jalna, for the offences punishable under sections 78, 79 Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Section 12 of POCSO.

3] The allegations against the applicant is that the applicant would follow the victim girl/informant by Creta car and on the relevant day i.e. on 25.12.2024 the informant along with her friend while passing from the

house of applicant, the informant disclosed to her friend that she is suffering from headache. The applicant having heard the same, told her to come and he would release her headache. It is the case of victim girl that the applicant is regularly following the victim girl and harassing her and accordingly F.I.R is registered against the applicant. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that except Section 12 of POCSO Act all other sections are bailable. This is a case where custodial interrogation of the applicant is not necessary.

4] The learned APP points out that there are three antecedents against the applicant. He also pointed out that there is non bailable warrant issued by the Sessions Court against the applicant for absconding in another case. The learned APP also submits that the brother of the applicant has also supported the case of informant.

5] *Prima-facie* there is involvement of applicant in the alleged crime. The applicant is absconding in another case. Considering the totality of the circumstances noted above, this is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant. Hence the application is dismissed.

6] It is also clarified that the observations made in this order are limited to the disposal of the present anticipatory bail application and the trial Court shall not be

influenced by the observations made hereinabove, in deciding the regular bail or at the stage of trial.

7] Adv. A. S. Jadhav learned counsel appointed by this Court to represent the cause of respondent no.2, shall be paid fees of Rs.10,000/- by the High Court Legal Aid Services Sub-Committee, Aurangabad.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER]
JUDGE

PRW