



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

930 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1171 OF 2024

KUMAR @ KRUSHNAKUMAR ROHIDAS SASANE

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mrs. Lomte Ashwini Annasaheb

APP for Respondents-State : Mr. B. B. Bhise

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 22.01.2025

P.C. :

1] Heard learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for both the respondents.

2] The applicant is apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.233 of 2024, registered at Renapur Police Station, District Latur, for the offences punishable under sections 143, 147, 148, 149, 294, 307, 323, 341, 353, 506 of I.P.C and under Sections 25 and 4 of the Arms Act, 1959.

3] The case against the applicant is that the applicant along with 25 to 30 persons have assaulted the informant i.e. Police Sub-Inspector on 21.06.2024 between 6.40 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. The informant had been to the hospital on 22.06.2024. The injury certificate shows that there is no visible injury seen on the body.

4] From the record, it does not appears that the informant was admitted to the hospital. However the F.I.R. is registered on 24.06.2024, but no plausible explanation has given for the delay in registering the F.I.R.

5] The learned APP submits that the applicant had been to the hospital on 22.06.2024 and he has produced the certificate which is at page No. 31. However the certificate as indicated above only shows that the informant was in hospital for medical examination on 22.06.2024 and he was not admitted in hospital and the report itself shows that there is no visible injury seen on the vital part of the body. The learned APP further submits that there are three antecedents against the applicant. The learned APP has to demonstrate that the applicant is involved in the offence.

6] *Prima Facie*, the case of the applicant appears to be plausible. The applicant is roped in this matter for some internal dispute in the department. In the complaint it is mentioned that while assaulting the informant the applicant had mentioned his link with the P.I. of the Police Station. It is stated that in pursuance of the complaint the P.I. and the complainant were both transferred out of Police Station.

7] Considering the same, the interim protection

granted by this Court dated 12.07.2024 stands confirmed on the following terms :

i] The applicant shall attend the concerned police station as and when required by the investigating officer.

ii] The applicant shall not tamper with the evidence of the prosecution in any manner. He shall not influence the informant, witnesses and other persons concerned with the case.

iii] The applicant shall co-operate with the investigation and also in the proceedings before the trial Court.

8] In the event, the applicant violates any of the conditions specified in this order, it shall be liable to be cancelled.

9] 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 proceed further in the matter without being influenced by the observations made hereinabove.

10] The application stands disposed of.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER]
JUDGE