

Ajit Pathrikar

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1151 OF 2025**

Mehraj @ Meraj Kaddan Khan	...Applicant
Versus	
State Of Maharashtra and Anr.	...Respondents

Ms. Neetu Singh, *for the Applicant.*
Mr. Anamika Malhotra, *APP for the State-Respondent No.1.*
Ms. Ruchika Ghag, Rashi Maknikar, Shavez Mansuri, *for*
Intervenor-First Informant.
PSI – Nitin Kamble, *Pairavi Adhikari, Amboli Police Station, is*
present.

CORAM Dr. Neela Gokhale, J.
DATED: 23rd September 2025

PC:-

- 1.** None for the Applicant.
- 2.** At the very outset, Ms. Anamika Malhotra, learned APP, brought to my notice order dated 29th April 2024 passed by this Court in the Applicant's former Bail Application No. 4297 of 2021. By way of the said order, his previous bail application was rejected on merits.

3. I have perused the order passed by this Court. It appears that this Court has dealt with every aspect of the matter and, upon a detailed discussion, rejected the said bail application on merits. However, in paragraph 35 of the said order, the Trial Court was directed to frame charges at the earliest and proceed with the trial without granting unnecessary adjournments to any of the parties.

4. Ms. Malhotra, on instructions, states that the charges are framed on 17th April 2025 and the matter is proceeding at an appropriate pace.

5. Ms. Ruchika Ghag, learned Counsel representing the Complainant, also points to the order dated 29th April 2024 rejecting the former bail application of the Applicant on merits. She points to paragraph 16 of the said order, which read thus:

“16. This is a very peculiar case wherein it is alleged that the applicant had been subjecting the victim to rape, unnatural sex, oral sex, discharging semen by forcing his penis in her mouth, administering some stupefying substance which aroused her sexual desire and above all, threatened her of dire consequences, in case, she discloses

his acts to anybody. Worst, his wife actively participated and assisted him in all his dubious and abominable crime for a continuous period of nine years ever since the victim was in 4th standard till lodging of the report.”

6. In view of the aforesaid arguments made by both the Counsel, I am not inclined to grant bail to the present Applicant. This is not a fit case to grant bail. In any case, this Court has already considered the entire matter on merits and has held *prima facie* that an offence is made out.

7. The present application is thus rejected.

Later at 3:00 p.m.

8. Ms. Neetu Singh, learned Counsel for the Applicant, appears and is apprised of the order.

(Dr. Neela Gokhale, J)