



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1444 OF 2025

Ravindra Limbaji Shinde

... Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra and others

... Respondents

.....

Ms. Ashwini Annasaheb Lomte, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. C. V. Bhadane, APP for Respondent-State.

Ms. Pooja K. Apache, Advocate for Respondent-victim (appointed)

.....

CORAM : ABHAY S. WAGHWASE, J.

Reserved on : 22.08.2025

Pronounced on : 25.08.2025

ORDER :

1. This is a pre arrest bail application, apprehending arrest in crime no. 0395 of 2025 registered at Shivajinagar Police Station, District Beed for offence under Sections 64(2)(m), 115(2), 351(2), 351(3) and 352 of BNS as well as Section 3/25 of the Arms Act.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant pointed out that, there is false implication. Informant, who is around 40 years of age and was acquainted with applicant since prior to 2007 and had several times maintained consensual physical relation, has subsequently lodged report with sole intention to grab and extort money by blackmailing.

Learned counsel pointed out that, there is documentary evidence suggesting transfer of amount at several times and the same is annexed at Exhibit "D". She also submitted that there are photographs of both, informant and accused, suggesting love affair and intimacy. Further, according to learned counsel, there is delay of over three weeks in lodging above report. That, there are cross complaints. Copy of FIR is also placed on record. That, applicant is a police officer and if he is arrested in false case, learned counsel points out that, his service career will be in jeopardy. For above reasons, she seeks indulgence by way of anticipatory bail.

3. Learned APP as well as learned counsel appointed to represent the complainant have both opposed on the ground that, there is forceful sexual rape on gun point. That, there are allegations of indulging in unnatural sex. There is exploitation. Learned APP pointed out that, statement of informant is also recorded under Section 183 of BNSS which is consistent with that of FIR. That, informant was assaulted and photographs of the same are also placed on record.

4. Perused the report dated 21.07.2025, wherein informant, who gave her as 39 years, reported police that she is married in May 2007.

Substance of the FIR is that, as informant's father was also in police department and they were residing in police line, present applicant was initially their neighbour. According to her, in spite of she getting married, applicant started developing contact with her and attempted to meet her in spite of her resistance and refusal. She has reported that, he demanded physical relations. That, in 2011 applicant got appointed as PSI and thereafter, she has alleged that, since her husband was out for marketing work, he used to visit her house. She reported that in March 2013 around 11.00 p.m., on gun point he raped her and even snapped her nude photographs, videos and threatened to make it viral and again and again raped her. She claims that she reported the above incidences to applicant's wife but she and her mother came, beat informant and threatened to lodge case of atrocity. She further reported that, in March 2024, while she was at Bhoom, he used to come home in night hours under influence of liquor, commit unnatural sex with her, beat her by means of belt and even threatened to harm her son. Last incidences of rape are reported to be of 17.02.2025, 01.06.2025 and 01.07.2025.

5. *Prima facie*, it is emerging from the report that informant and applicant were initially neighbours. She seems to have got married in 2007, but according to her, accused continued to approach her in

spite of her resistance and refusal. However, allegation of forceful rape on gun point is levelled i.e. after applicant got appointed as API. She has also reported about her nude photographs and videograph being done and threats being issued to make it viral. At least from the FIR there is nothing to suggest that she was consenting party. Rather, she seems to be a married lady having a daughter and two sons and she has alleged disadvantage of absence of her husband taken while he was on marketing tour. In the light of above nature of allegations, and photographs of injuries which are part of police papers, this Court is not inclined to extend benefit of anticipatory bail. Hence, following order :

ORDER

- I. The application is rejected.
- II. Fees of the learned counsel appointed to represent-victim be paid by the High Court Legal Services Sub Committee, Aurangabad as per Rules.

[ABHAY S. WAGHWASE, J.]