

Shivgan

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3874 of 2025

Firoz Ali Hasan Khan ...Applicant
Versus
The State of Maharashtra and Anr. ...Respondents

Mr. Tohid Shaikh, *i/b Anjali Patil, for the Applicant.*
Ms Manisha R Tidke, *APP for the State-Respondent.*
Mr R A Pakhare, *PSI attached to Mumbra Police Station,*
present.

CORAM Dr. Neela Gokhale, J.
DATED: 10th October 2025

PC:-

1. At the very outset, Mr. Tohid Shaikh, learned Advocate appearing for the Applicant, has brought to my attention order dated 25th September 2025 passed by this Court in Criminal Bail Application No.2344 of 2025 of the present Applicant himself.

2. On that date, i.e., on 25th September 2025, none appeared for the Applicant. The matter was heard and

dismissed on merits. Hence, he has filed the present Bail Application for the relief as prayed.

3. Mr. Tohid Shaikh, learned counsel appearing for the Applicant, submits that since none appeared for the Applicant, he was unable to bring to the notice of this Court certain photographs. The said photographs are taken on record. By way of these photographs, he seeks to indicate that there is a medical clinic of one doctor namely, Imran Khan, which is exactly opposite to the shop of the Applicant. He submits that since there are always people in the clinic, it is not possible that the incident as alleged, could have happened without anybody knowing about it. On this ground, he says that the Applicant be released on bail.

4. He further submits that there is no independent witness, who has given statement corroborating the story of the Victim. On these two grounds, in addition to those averred in the Application, Mr. Shaikh, learned counsel, prays that the Applicant be enlarged on bail.

5. I have considered the factual matrix as well as the material on record.

6. Only because the medical clinic opposite to the store of the Applicant was generally inhabited by the people, does not take away gravity of the offence as allegedly committed by the Applicant. I am not impressed by the said submissions. In the order dated 25th September 2025 passed in the earlier Bail Application, this Court had dealt with the grounds averred in the application as well as the material on record in detail. I see no reason to deviate from the said order, passed only 15 days earlier, as there is no change in the circumstances.

7. The Bail Application is accordingly, rejected.

(Dr. Neela Gokhale, J)

Digitally
signed by
SHAMBHAVI
NILESH
SHIVGAN
Date:
2025.10.10
19:40:14
+0530