

Ajit Pathrikar

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 966 OF 2025

Ibrahim Husain Rais Sayyed ...Applicant

Versus

State Of Maharashtra and Anr. ...Respondents.

None for the Applicant.

Ms. Poonam P. Bhosale, APP for the State-Respondent.

Mr. Saurabh K. Raut, for Respondent No.2.

PSI – Sanjay S. Ghag, Pairavi Adhikari, Malawani Police Station, is present.

CORAM Dr. Neela Gokhale, J.

DATED: 24th September 2025

PC:-

1. The matter was heard in detail yesterday i.e. 23rd September 2025. It was kept today i.e. 24th September 2025, to facilitate the Counsel for Respondent No.2 as well as the learned APP to tender certain orders which were not available yesterday.

2. Today, when the matter was called out, none appeared for the Applicant. Ms. Poonam Bhosale, learned Counsel for the APP, tendered three orders. The same are taken on record.

3. From the orders submitted by Ms. Bhosale, it appears that the Applicant had filed bail application before the Trial Court and by order dated 21st April 2025, the Trial Court had rejected the bail application. Thereafter, the Applicant filed the present Bail Application No. 966 of 2025. On 7th March 2025, this Court, after hearing the Counsel for both the parties, issued notice to the private respondent i.e. victim in the present case and also directed the police officer to ascertain as to whether she required legal representation through Legal Aid. Mr. Saurabh Raut came to be appointed from the panel of the Legal Aid to represent the Respondent No.2.

4. Today, Mr. Saurabh Raut drew my attention to the order dated 1st April 2025 passed by this Court in the present bail application. In paragraph 6, this Court has recorded the submission of Mr. Raut that it is the Applicant who is delaying the framing of charges before the Trial Court and has taken adjournments. The matter was then posted for 9th April 2025 and the Advocate for the Applicant was directed to apprise

this Court regarding the allegation of Mr. Raut that it was the Applicant who is delaying the framing of charges and consequently the trial. On 9th April 2025, there was none present for the Applicant. Once again 11th August 2025, none appeared for the Applicant.

5. From the order dated 25th August 2025 tendered before me by Ms. Bhosale, it transpires that during the pendency of the present bail application, the Applicant filed another bail application in this very Court bearing Bail Application No. 1193 of 2025. Without disclosing that the present bail application is already pending before this Court, the Counsel for the Applicant canvassed for grant of bail in the latter bail application i.e. Bail Application No. 1193 of 2025. By order dated 25th August 2025, this Court in Bail Application No. 1193 of 2025 directed the Trial Court to frame charges and record evidence of the victim within a period of three months from the date of the said order. Liberty was given to the Applicant to apply for bail after the evidence of the victim was recorded.

6. It transpires that the Applicant has deliberately misled this Court by filing successive bail applications, despite the former bail application already pending before the Court. There are different Counsel appearing in both the bail applications. This shows the conduct of the Applicant misleading this Court and attempting to obtain orders without revealing material information. Such conduct of the Applicant is deprecated.

7. In view of the aforesaid, the present bail application stands rejected.

8. The Counsel for the Respondent No.2 and the learned APP appearing before this Court are requested to bring to the notice of the Trial Court the present order, through the prosecutor appearing before the Trial Court as well as through the Investigating Officer of the case.

(Dr. Neela Gokhale, J)