



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

948 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 738 OF 2025

Sangita Shivaji Sapkal

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Another

...

Mr. Narayan B. Narwade - Advocate for Applicant

Mr. S. K. Shirse - APP for State

Mr. D.K. Rajput and Mr. C. D. - Advocates to Assist PP

...

CORAM : NEERAJ P DHOTE, J.

DATED : 16TH SEPTEMBER, 2025

PER COURT : -

1. As the Applicant is apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No. 0342 of 2025 registered with Pathardi Police Station, District Ahilyanagar, for offences punishable under Sections 190, 191(3), 191(2), 189(2), 351(2), 352, 115(2), 118(1), 118(2) and 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, he approached this Court by filing the present Application for Anticipatory Bail.

2. The Prosecution's case is that, on account of the property dispute between the family members of the Informant and the FIR named accused persons, the Accused persons including the Applicants assaulted the Informant in the afternoon of 26.03.2025. The Informant was assaulted by a deadly weapon for which he had to take medical treatment.

3. Perusal of the papers show that, the Applicant, who is the wife of Accused No. 3 – Shivaji, is named in the report. The role of assault by stick on the stomach of the Informant, and bite on the left hand of the Informant is attributed to the Applicant. The Injury Certificate shows injury on the ear of the Informant. The role of using the weapon is attributed to the other accused persons. The Accused

Shivaji is released on regular bail by this Court, and anticipatory bail is granted to co-accused Saurabh by the learned Sessions Court. There is previous FIR bearing Crime No. 0326 of 2025 by the Applicant against the Informant registered with the same Police Station for offences punishable under Sections 118(1), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. The delay in lodging the FIR by the Informant in the case in hand is on account of his hospitalization. There appears to be N.C. by the Informant against the accused persons that they have threatened him. The same is denied by the Applicant. Considering the dispute between both the parties, it is a matter of investigation as to whether the threat was given or not. This Court after considering all the aspects of the matter, has protected the Applicant by interim order dated 05.05.2025. In this view of the matter and considering the role attributed to the Applicant, I am inclined to confirm the interim order. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

- [i] The interim protection granted to the Applicant by this Court vide order dated 05.05.2025, is confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

- [ii] The Application stands disposed off.

[NEERAJ P. DHOTE]
JUDGE

SG Punde