

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 1181 of 2025

Sudhakar Ankush Pawar

Age 42 years, Occ. Career

Academy, R/o. Wathar Station,

Tal. Koregaon, Dist. Satara.

... Applicant

versus

The State of Maharashtra

(To be served through the PI

Wathar Police Station)

...Respondent

Mr Shailesh D Chavan a/w Mr Hrishikesh S Avhad, for the Applicant.

Mr S M Mangaonkar, APP, for Respondent / State.

PHC 2275, Anandrao Venkat Bhosale, Wathar Police Station, Tal. Koregaon, Satara, is present.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.

Date: 28 July 2025

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr Shailesh Chavan, the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant and Mr S M Mangaonkar, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent / State.

2. By this application, the applicant seeks pre-arrest bail in

connection with C.R. No.76 of 2025, registered at Wathar Police Station, Satara, for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 119(1), 118(1), 115(2), and 352 read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution alleges that on 7 April 2025, the applicant, in collusion with his brother and co-accused, intentionally rammed their motorcycle into the informant's scooter with the specific intent to cause his death. Following the collision, the applicant, Madhukar, and two unidentified accomplices physically assaulted the informant by punching him and pelting him with stones. Soon thereafter, the applicant's parents arrived at the location and actively participated in the assault by striking the informant with wooden sticks. Furthermore, it is claimed that during the course of the attack, Madhukar forcibly removed a gold chain from around the informant's neck.

4. The learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant asserts the applicant's innocence and submits that the entire case has been instituted with malafide intent, arising out of a monetary dispute. Specifically, the learned Counsel points out that the informant's sister was previously enrolled at the applicant's educational academy, but had failed to pay the fees

for the course. It is the applicant's case that the present FIR has been lodged solely with the intent to evade payments of the said dues and to falsely implicate the applicant in a criminal proceedings.

5. The learned Counsel further submits that, contrary to the allegations made in the FIR, it was infact the informant and his associates who were the aggressors in the alleged incident. In this regard, the learned Counsel draws the attention of this Court to the fact that a counter FIR has already been registered against the informant and his associates, substantiating the applicant's version of events.

6. The learned Counsel also submits that there is no recovery or discovery to be effected from the applicant, and therefore, custodial interrogation is not warranted. The learned Counsel submits that the applicant is willing to cooperate with the investigation and undertakes to comply with any conditions that this Court deem fit to impose.

7. Upon perusing the records, and more particularly the First Information Report (FIR), it appears that the applicant has not been attributed the use of any weapon during the alleged incident. His involvement, as per the prosecution's own case, is

restricted to an alleged physical assault on the informant by means of fist blows. The nature of the injuries sustained by the informant appears to be simple and not grievous. It further appears that a cross FIR has also been registered against the informant, indicating a mutual altercation. There appears a delay in lodging the FIR which remains unexplained on record. It is also brought to the attention of this Court that the investigation is at an advanced stage and is likely to culminate in the filing of a charge sheet shortly. There is no material suggesting that any recovery or further discovery is to be made at the instance of the applicant.

8. The apprehensions expressed by the prosecution with respect to the possibility of the applicant tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses can be addressed by imposing suitable conditions.

9. In view of the foregoing circumstances, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present application. Accordingly, the following order is passed.

ORDER

(i) In the event of the applicant's arrest in connection with C.R. No.76 of 2025, registered at Wathar Police Station, Satara, he shall be released on

bail upon executing a PR Bond of Rs.25,000/- and furnishing one or more sureties in the like amount.

(ii) The applicant shall attend the concerned police station as and when required by the Investigating Officer.

(iii) The applicant, himself or through any other person, shall not indulge in any activities that would tamper the prosecution evidence or influence the witnesses.

10. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

(R.N. Laddha, J.)