



(1)

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

946 CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 531 OF 2025

1. RAVI RAMRAO RAMANGIRE
2. SAVITA W/O RAVI RAMANGIREAPPELLANTS

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Thr. Superintendent of Police, Hingoli
2. The Investigation Officer,
Kurunda Police Station,
Tq. Basmat, Dist. Hingoli
3. Anjana Balaji DhakreRESPONDENTS

.....

Mr Rahul S. Pawar, Advocate for Appellants
Ms A. S. Mantri, APP for Respondent Nos.1 & 2/State
Mr Yogesh Bolkar, Advocate for Respondent No.3

.....

CORAM : SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.

DATE : 12 NOVEMBER 2025

P. C. :

1. At the outset, learned Advocate for the appellants submits that appellant No.2/Savita Ravi Ramangire had already granted anticipatory bail by the learned Sessions Court, however, inadvertently name of appellant No.2 has been inserted in the title clause of this matter. He, therefore, seeks leave to withdraw this appeal to the extent

(2)

of appellant No.2. As such, this appeal is disposed of as withdrawn to the extent of appellant No.2.

2. By this appeal, appellant No.1/Ravi Ramrao Ramangire is praying for quashing and setting aside the order dated 24/06/2025, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Basmatnagar, Dist. Hingoli, below Exhibit-1 in Criminal Bail Application No.136/2025 whereby, the said application preferred by the appellants for grant of anticipatory bail was rejected to the extent of appellant No.1. Through this appeal, appellant No.1 is also praying for grant of anticipatory bail in the aforesaid crime.

3. The aforesaid anticipatory bail application was preferred in relation to Crime bearing FIR No.240/2025 registered on 01/06/2025 with Kurunda Police Station, District Hingoli, for the offences punishable under Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, 'the Atrocities Act') and under Sections 352, 351(2), 296, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. The FIR came to be lodged at the behest of respondent No.3/ informant.

4. The aforesaid crime was registered on the basis of the report lodged by respondent No.3/informant, stating therein that, on

(3)

14/04/2025, she alongwith other 4 to 5 persons were engaged into cutting of the wheat through the mediator Bandu Senderao in the field belonging to applicant No.1 and they were assured to give 25 पायल्या wheat in exchange of said work. According to the informant, on 20/04/2025, at about 1.00 p.m., when they had gone to demand their wheat as agreed, the accused persons alleged to have abused them by referring to their caste and also threatened to kill them. Accordingly, the informant has lodged the report with the Police Station. On the basis of aforesaid report, the Investigating Officer registered aforesaid Crime No.0240/2025 and initiated the investigation.

5. Heard learned Advocate Mr Pawar for the appellants, learned APP Ms Mantri for respondent Nos.1 and 2/State and learned Advocate Mr Bolkar for respondent No.3.

6. Mr Pawar, learned Advocate for the appellants states that the FIR is filed almost after a period of 40 days of the alleged incident and there is no explanation tendered by the informant or the prosecution as regards delay in lodging the said FIR. He further submits that the appellant has falsely implicated in the instant crime. He further submits that there is no independent witnesses to support the case of the informant. He further submits that, by virtue of interim

(4)

order granted to the appellant, the appellant is regularly attending the concerned Police Station, and as such, has not misused the liberty given by this Court. Accordingly, he submits that since the investigation of the instant crime is almost over and mere filing of charge-sheet is remained, there is no requirement of custodial interrogation of the appellant No.1 and nothing is required to be seized from him. In view of these submissions, learned Advocate for the appellant prays for allowing of the instant appeal.

7. Per contra, learned APP Ms Mantri for respondents/State strongly opposes the present appeal for anticipatory bail to appellant No.1 and states that the appellant is involved in a serious crime against the members of Schedule Tribe community. The offence is serious. The investigation is still going on. The accused has committed crime by referring caste of the informant for the offence punishable under provisions of the Atrocities Act and as such, he does not deserve to grant anticipatory bail. Thus, she prays for rejection of the appeal.

8. Mr Bolkar, learned Advocate for respondent No.3/informant also tried to justify the order passed by the learned Additional Sessions Court, rejecting anticipatory bail application of the appellant. He submits that the accused has clearly abused the

(5)

informant by referring to her caste. He relies upon the judgment delivered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Kiran Vs. Rajkumar Jivraj Jain and another, 2025(3) Crimes 331(SC)**. He also submits that, in view of the said judgment, since the accused has humiliated and insulted the informant by uttering her caste, he is not entitled for grant of anticipatory bail. He further submits that, if the appellant is released on bail, he may threaten the prosecution witnesses and may tamper evidence. He, therefore, prays for rejection of the appeal.

9. Considering the arguments advanced by the learned Advocates for the respective parties before this Court, and after having gone through the investigation papers made available to this Court by the learned APP, it is clear that transaction between the parties was based on oral trust. Alleged incident took place on account of getting their labour payments. The informant has alleged that the accused has abused her in chorus and no specific allegations are referred in the report.

10. Considering the fact that the offence is registered belatedly after a period of about 40 days and the investigation in the instant crime is almost completed and mere formality of filing of

(6)

charge-sheet is remained, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to appellant No.1. Hence, the following order :-

ORDER

- a) The Criminal Appeal stands allowed.
- b) The impugned order dated 24/06/2025, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Basmatnagar, Dist. Hingoli, below Exhibit-1 in Criminal Bail Application No.136/2025, is hereby quashed and set aside to the extent of appellant No.1.
- c) In the event of arrest of the appellant No.1 in connection with Crime bearing FIR No.240/2025 registered on 01/06/2025 with Kurunda Police Station, District Hingoli, for the offences punishable under Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, 'the Atrocities Act') and under Sections 352, 351(2), 296, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, he shall be released on furnishing PR bond of Rs.25,000/- [Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only], with one solvent surety/ security in the like amount.

(7)

d) The appellant shall attend the concerned police station as and when called by the Investigating Officer. He is further directed to co-operate in the investigation.

e) The appellant shall furnish details of residential address and other contact details such as the mobile number etc. to the concerned Police Station. If there is any change in the contact details, the same shall be immediately informed to the concerned Police Station.

f) The appellant shall not try to contact or pressurize the witnesses or the informant, in any manner whatsoever.

11. However, it is made clear that the observations made in this order are *prima facie* in nature for the purpose of adjudication of this appeal.

[SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.]

sjk