

AGK

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1631 OF 2025

Harpreet Singh Pawar &
Gurubindar Singh Lakhansingh Sandhu ... Applicants

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra, &
Chandrakant Machindra Salunkhe ... Respondent

Ms. Suvarna Yadav for the applicants.

Mrs. Rajashree V. Newton, APP for respondent No.1-
State.

Mr. Akshay Lengare with Mr. Anis Shaikh, & Mr. Aniket
Sangle for respondent No.2.

Digitally
signed by
ATUL
GANESH
KULKARNI
Date:
2025.09.08
17:46:44
+0530

CORAM : AMIT BORKAR, J.

DATED : SEPTEMBER 8, 2025

P.C.:

1. The applicants apprehend arrest in connection with Crime Register No. 25 of 2025 registered with Kalamboli Police Station, District Raigad, for offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 189(4), 189(2), 118(2), 118(1), 117(2), and 115(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS). They have, therefore, approached this Court by filing the present application seeking anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 4 February 2025 at about 2.30 p.m., the complainant along with his son and wife was at home. At that time, Jaspreet Singh Pawar, son of Paramjit Kaur

and resident of the flat below the complainant, asked for the terrace key. The complainant told him to obtain the key from the society with due permission. This led to an argument between Jaspreet Singh and the complainant's family. Meanwhile, Jaspreet Singh's brother's wife Rajvinder Kaur and Paramjit Kaur also came there, joined the quarrel, and allegedly assaulted the complainant's wife. When the complainant and his son tried to intervene, Harpreet Singh Pawar and two others also came and, in the course of the scuffle, Harpreet Singh allegedly bit the complainant's right thumb causing fracture. Further, one unknown person who accompanied Jaspreet Singh and Harpreet Singh was armed with a kripa (knife) and is alleged to have inflicted a blow on the stomach of the complainant's son Rohit, causing serious injuries. The complainant, his wife Sampada, and son Rohit were also assaulted by the accused persons with fists and hands. The complainant's wife was allegedly held by Jaspreet Singh, Paramjit Kaur, Rajvinder Kaur, and another woman, who struck her head on the ground. In this manner, the complainant's family suffered multiple injuries, including grievous injury to Rohit. Based on this incident, the FIR came to be lodged.

3. Learned Advocate for the applicants argued that the applicants have been falsely implicated. He submitted that there was no intention on their part to commit murder. He pointed out that the Sessions Court has already granted anticipatory bail to accused Nos. 2 to 5 and 7, and placed reliance on the same to contend that the applicants also deserve similar protection. He further submitted that considering the nature of the incident,

custodial interrogation of the applicants is not necessary.

4. On the other hand, learned APP and the learned Advocate for the complainant opposed the application. They relied upon the injury certificates and the medical record to point out that applicant No. 1 caused grievous injuries which led to amputation of the complainant's thumb, besides inflicting three incised wounds with the kripan (knife). They submitted that the statements of the injured and witnesses clearly attribute these injuries to the present applicants. They therefore contended that a prima facie case is made out against the applicants for causing grievous hurt with dangerous weapons. On this basis, they urged that the anticipatory bail application deserves to be rejected.

5. I have considered the rival submissions and perused the material on record. The injury certificate shows that the complainant suffered grievous injury leading to amputation of his thumb. The medical record also reflects that the son of the complainant sustained a serious stab injury on the stomach caused by a sharp weapon like kripan. The statements of the injured and eye-witnesses clearly attribute these injuries to the present applicants.

6. The nature of the assault, the weapon used, and the severity of injuries prima facie indicate that the applicants actively participated in the incident and caused grievous hurt with dangerous weapons. The offence alleged is serious in nature and carries grave consequences. The role of each applicant has been specifically mentioned in the FIR and is supported by medical

evidence.

7. The reliance placed by the applicants on the grant of anticipatory bail to co-accused does not advance their case. The allegations against the present applicants are distinct and graver in comparison to those against the other accused. The medical evidence on record prima facie supports the prosecution version that the applicants themselves inflicted grievous injuries.

8. At this stage, custodial interrogation of the applicants cannot be said to be unnecessary. Grant of anticipatory bail in such serious offences would hamper the proper course of investigation. The balance of interest of justice, therefore, does not lean in favour of the applicants.

9. Considering the overall facts and circumstances, I am of the opinion that no case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail. The application, therefore, stands rejected.

10. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(AMIT BORKAR, J.)