

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 312 OF 2025

Prem Ashok Harchandani	...Applicant
Versus	
State Of Maharashtra	...Respondent

Mr. Amit Singh, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. Anand S. Shalgaonkar, APP for the State.

Mr. Vijaykumar Rathod, PSI a/w. Abhijit Gaikwad, Head Constable,
Anti Extortion Cell, Thane City, Crime Branch, present.

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.

DATED : 24 FEBRUARY 2025

PC.:

1. The present Application is filed by the Applicant under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for anticipatory bail in connection with C.R. No. 0949 of 2024, dated 6 December 2024, registered with Rabodi Police Station, District Thane, under Sections 310 (2), 309 (6), 3 (5), 49, 61 (2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that on 5 December 2024, at around 11.30 p.m., the Informant was traveling in a cab from

cadbury junction. At that time, four persons on two motorcycles arrived at the spot and introduced themselves as police and custom officers, forcing the Informant's cab to stop. The Accused persons then robbed the Informant's bag and her valuables. Consequently, the F.I.R. was registered.

3. The learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that though there are a few antecedents against the present Applicant, no F.I.R. has ever been lodged against him for offences punishable under Section 310 (2), 309 (6), 3 (5), 49, 61 (2) of the BNS Act. As far as four antecedents are concerned, the Applicant has already been granted bail. He submits that his client is willing to comply with any directions imposed by this Court.

4. The learned APP submits that there are at least four antecedents against the present Applicant. In the present proceedings, there are seven Accused persons, out of which six Accused persons have already been arrested.

5. He further submits that entire amount of money robbed from the Informant has not yet been recovered. A sum of 32 Saudi Dinars remains to be recovered. Additionally, Out of six Accused persons, Nita and Mohit have specifically stated in their statements

that the present Applicant was the main person who planned the robbery. The Accused Mohit has specifically stated that the weapon used in the crime was handed over the present Applicant.

6, Therefore, the learned APP submits that the present Anticipatory Bail Application should be rejected and that the Applicant's custody is necessary for further investigation.

7. I have heard the learned Advocates for both sides. The present Applicant has at least four antecedents cases against him. Out of seven Accused, six have been arrested, and three of them have been granted bail.

8. Accused Nita and Accused Mohit has specifically stated that the present Applicant had planned how to perform the present crime. The entire amount robbed in the present crime has not yet been recovered.

9. There is strong apprehension that if the present Applicant is released on bail, he is likely to influence the Informant. Additionally, considering his antecedents, there is a risk that he may commit further offenses once released on bail.

10. In such a circumstances, according to me, no case is made

out to grant any kind of protection to the Applicant. Hence, **the Anticipatory Bail Application is rejected.**

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)