

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 441 OF 2025

Rajiv Ranjan ...Applicant
V/s.
1. The State of Maharashtra
2. Harbinder Narain Rana ...Respondents.

.....

Mr. Sandeep Singh a/w. Mr. Dhairya Parekh i/b Mr. Satyadev Joshi
for the Applicant.
Mr. B.V. Holambe Patil, APP for the Respondent/State.
PI Ummesh M. Dandile, Goregaon Police Station present.

.....

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : 19.11.2025.

P.C. :

1. The applicant in the present application is the first informant in Crime No. 617 of 2025 registered at Goregaon Police Station, Mumbai for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 308(2), 356(3) and 61 (2) of the Bharatiya Nayay Sanhita, 2023.
2. By the order dated 6th November 2025 in Anticipatory Bail Application No. 1434 of 2025, the learned Sessions Court has allowed the application filed by the respondent No.2 herein, who is accused No.3 in the aforesaid crime, for anticipatory bail. The present application is filed seeking cancellation of said anticipatory bail granted by the Sessions Court to respondent No.2.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the respondent No.1/State.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the allegation against respondent No.2 are of extortion. It is submitted that the Sessions Court, without considering the seriousness of the offence, granted anticipatory bail to respondent No.2. It is submitted that during the pendency of the application for anticipatory bail before the Sessions Court the respondent No.2 was directed to attend the concerned police station. It is submitted that the said condition was not complied with and the same was brought to the notice of the Sessions Court. It is submitted that inspite of it the Sessions Court has granted anticipatory bail to the respondent No.2. It is submitted that the anticipatory bail granted to the respondent No.2 therefore, needs to be cancelled.

5. Learned APP for the respondent No.1/State, on instructions, submits that the respondent No.2 has attended the police station.

6. I have perused the first information report. The allegations of extortion are against the co-accused Parul Rana. The learned Sessions Court has assigned valid reasons for granting anticipatory bail to the respondent No.2. Therefore, no case is made out to entertain the present application. Hence, the Application is rejected.

[N.R.BORKAR, J.]