

Arun Sankpal

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1231 OF 2025

Haresh Ramji Bhanushali

..Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra & Ors

...Respondents

Mr. Tushar Sonawane, for the Applicant

Mr. P. P. Malshe, APP, for Respondent No.1-State.

Shri S.Y. Dhole, Bhivandi Police Station present.

CORAM: N. J. JAMADAR, J.

DATE : 13th NOVEMBER 2025

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.
2. The challenge in this Application is to an order dated 30th October 2025, whereby the Investigating Officer was directed not to take coercive steps against the Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, who have filed an Application for pre-arrest bail being Criminal Bail Application No. 1065 of 2025.
3. Mr. Sonawane, the learned Counsel for the Applicant, submitted that by an order dated 27nd October 2025, the learned Additional Sessions Judge had rejected the prayer for ad-interim reliefs by a reasoned order and, yet, on 13th October 2025, directed not to take coercive steps.

ARUN
RAMCHANDRA
SANKPAL

Digitally signed by
ARUN
RAMCHANDRA
SANKPAL
Date: 2025.11.13
14:11:27 +0530

4. From the perusal of the impugned order, it appears that on 30th October 2025, the Investigating Officer has sought time to file say and, therefore, the learned Additional Sessions Judge was persuaded to direct not to take coercive steps against the Respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

5. The Court is informed that the application for pre-arrest bail is listed for hearing before the learned Sessions Judge, today.

6. In these circumstances, without delving into the legality and correctness of the impugned order and since the Bail Application is listed before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, it would be expedient that, the Additional Sessions Judge decides the application for pre-arrest bail, finally, as expeditiously as possible.

7. In the event, the application is required to be adjourned, on account of the time sought by the prosecution, the learned Sessions Judge is requested to pass a reasoned order instead of directing that no coercive action be taken against the Respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

8. Application disposed.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]