

sg

3.appln31-25.docx

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

Criminal Application No.31 of 2025

Vikas Dhondibhau Dhamale

Age: 42 years; Occ: Rikshaw Garage,

R/o: Sudamachi Nagari,

Room No.2, Rakshewadi,

Tal. Khed, Dist.:Pune

... Applicant

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra

(At the instance of F.I.R. No.671 of 2024
registered with Khed Police Station, Pune.)

2. Vikrant Sahebrao Jadhav,

Age: 18 years, Occ: F.Y. B.Com. Student,

R/o: Roundhalwadi, Kohinde Bk,

Tal.: Khed, Dist.: Pune

... Respondents

Ms Sneha Pawar, i/b. Vishal Kolekar, for the applicant.

Mr Prashant Jadhav, APP, for respondent No.1/ State.

None for respondent No.2.

API PS Sisode, Khed Police Station, Pune Rural, is present.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.

Date: 1 July 2025.

P.C.:

. Heard Ms Sneha Pawar, the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant; and Prashant Jadhav, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, representing the respondent/State.

2. The applicant has preferred this application seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the accused/respondent No.2, by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Khed-Rajgurunagar, Pune.

3. The applicant's contention is that the learned Judge failed to delve into the substantive merits of the prosecution case at the time of granting pre-arrest bail. The pre-arrest bail was granted within 20 days from lodging the FIR.

4. On the contrary, the learned APP submits that the investigation has been concluded and the charge-sheet is ready to be filed. The learned APP further submits that the applicant has attended the police station on more than ten occasions and cooperated with the investigation. There is nothing to be recovered or restored from the applicant. The prosecution does not seek the custody of the applicant.

5. It is a settled principle in law that once granted, the bail should not be cancelled without compelling or extraordinary circumstances, such as the risk of jeopardising a fair trial, as highlighted in *Dolat Ram v. State of Haryana*¹. Furthermore, in *Puran v. Rambilas*² which was enunciated by at the

¹ (2001) 6 SCC 338

² (1995) 1 SCC 349

preliminary bail stage, the Court should not undertake the detailed examination of the evidence and elaborate documentation of the merits of the case. The circumstances for grant of bail and there is cancellation of bail are entirely different. The record shows that the alleged offence was occurred in December 2024. During the intervening period, investigation has been completed. There is nothing to be recovered or restored from the applicant. The applicant has cooperated with the investigation, as fairly conceded by the learned APP, and attended the concerned police station on ten occasions. Furthermore, there is nothing on record to suggest that the accused/respondent No.2 forged or attempted to interfere with the prosecution's evidence or influence the witnesses. The records do not indicate that the accused has misused the bail concession granted to him. That apart, at this stage, the investigation completed, charge sheet is ready to be filed, and in absence of new compelling ground post bail, this Court is not inclined to grant the prayer for bail revocation.

6. In light of above, the application stands rejected.

(R.N. Laddha, J.)