



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

44 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 285 OF 2025

RAVINDRA MANIK GAIKWAD AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Doifode Bharat Sahebrao
APP for Respondents 1 & 2 : Mr. G.O. Wattamwar
...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 17/03/2025

PER COURT :

1. Heard the learned counsel for the applicants and the learned APP for the respondents-State.
2. The applicant is apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No. 310/2024 dated 21.6.2024 registered with Jamner Police Station, Tal. Jamner, District Jalgaon, for the offences punishable under sections 143, 147, 148, 307, 308, 323, 332, 333, 341, 342, 353, 427, 435, 504, 506 of IPC, under sections 3 and 7 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, under section 7 of Criminal Law Amendment Act and under section 37(1)(3) r/w. 135 of Maharashtra Police Act.
3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that large number of people have gathered near the police station and in the FIR no specific role is attributed to the applicant. Relying on the judgment in the case of **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors. reported in (2011) 1 SCC 694**, the learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is ready to cooperate with the investigation and that the custodial interrogation of the applicant is not necessary for the purpose of investigation.

4. Per contra, the learned APP points out that the present applicant and others had pelted stones on the police station and caused injuries to 14 police personals, out of which 3 have sustained grievous injuries. The learned APP submits that video recording of the incident is available and the applicant is seen pelting stones on the police and he has been identified by the other co-accused and role of applicant is direct in the crime.

5. Considered the submissions and perused the record. It appears that from the CCTV footage the applicant is identified by the other co-accused and 14 police persons have sustained injuries during incident out of which 3 have sustained grievous injuries. Although the learned counsel for applicant has relied upon the case of **Siddharam Mhetre** cited supra. The same cannot be applied to the facts of this case. In the present case, direct role is attributed to the applicant on the basis of CCTV footage. Considering this aspect of the matter, the application is dismissed. The interim protection granted on 4.3.2025 is vacated.

6. It is clarified that the observations made in this order are limited to the disposal of the present anticipatory bail application and the trial Court shall proceed further in the matter without being influenced by the observations made hereinabove.

7. The application stands disposed of.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.]

SSC/