

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

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 2392 of 2024

Mukesh Ghisulal Solanki
Age about 26 years, Indian
Inhabitant, Occ. Service,
R/at. J-16, 6th Main Road,
MES Road, Bahubali Nagar,
Bangalore North,
Karnataka – 560 013.

... Applicant

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
(At the instance of Airport Police
Station)

2. First informant

... Respondents

Mr Kishor Parihariya a/w Mr Jayram Karnani a/w Mr Atish
Kamble i/b Mr Avdhesh Kanoojiya, for the Applicant.

Mr S V Walve, APP, for Respondent / State.

Mr Manoj Sitapure, for Respondent No.2.

PSI Amruta K Pandhare, Airport Police Station, Mumbai, is
present.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.

Date: 16 July 2025

P.C.:

Leave to amend. Necessary amendment shall be carried
out forthwith.

2. By this application, the applicant seeks pre-arrest bail in connection with CR No.69 of 2024, registered at Airport Police Station, Mumbai, for the offences punishable under Section 498A, 506, and 406 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. On 13 April 2024, the informant filed a First Information Report (FIR), alleging that she was subjected to harassment and cruelty by the applicant following their marriage. According to the FIR, the informant married the applicant on 21 November 2021. However, soon after the marriage, the applicant began to ill-treat and mentally harass her. It is further alleged that the applicant persistently demanded money from her and, in a deeply disturbing manner, exerted pressure on her to engage in physical relations with his maternal brother.

4. The learned Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He contends that the applicant and the informant were residing together with the applicant's mother and therefore, the allegations against him regarding exerting pressure on the applicant is not at all digestible. Furthermore, the investigation into the alleged offence has already been completed, and there is no requirement for the applicant's custodial interrogation. It is also brought to the attention of this Court that the co-

accused persons involved in the same case have already been granted anticipatory bail, thereby entitling the applicant to similar relief on the grounds of parity.

5. The learned Counsel for respondent No.2 opposed the application and submits that the offence is of a grave and serious nature. During the informant's stay with the applicant, the applicant repeatedly subjected her to harassment through inappropriate behaviour and unwelcome conduct.

6. At the outset, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor fairly concedes that the investigation has already been completed, nothing remains to be recovered or discovered from the applicant, and the prosecution is intending to file the charge sheet shortly. Furthermore, the learned APP submits that custody of the applicant is not necessary.

7. Upon perusing the records, it appears that the allegations made in the FIR against the present applicant appear to have stemmed from issues arising out of a matrimonial dispute. The co-accused have already been granted the benefit of anticipatory bail. The investigation in the matter has since been completed, and there is no requirement for custodial interrogation of the applicant. Moreover, nothing is to be recovered or discovered from the applicant in connection with

the alleged offence. The prosecution has not sought the custody of the applicant at this stage.

8. Considering the above facts and circumstances, this Court finds it appropriate to grant the anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the application is allowed on the following terms :

(i) In the event of the applicant's arrest in connection with CR No.69 of 2024, registered at Airport Police Station, Mumbai, 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.

9. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

[R.N. Laddha, J.]