

sg

50.aba1875-25.docx

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

Anticipatory Bail Application No.1875 of 2025

Tanveer Kapadia ... Applicant

versus

The State of Maharashtra and Anr ... Respondents

With

Anticipatory Bail Application No.1874 of 2025

Tanzil Kapadia ... Applicant

versus

The State of Maharashtra and Anr ... Respondents

Dr Sujay Kantawala, a/w. Ms Aishwarya Kantawala, Mr Jeffry Caleb and Ms Ayushi Jha, for the applicants in both ABAs.

Mr Arfan Sait, APP, for respondent No.1/ State.

Ms Nitee Punde, a/w. Mr Mamta Omle, for respondent No.2 in both ABAs.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.

Date: 11 August 2025.

P.C.:

. The learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants submits that the applicants had earlier preferred an application for anticipatory bail before the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Pannel, Raigad. The learned

Additional Sessions Judge was pleased to grant interim protection by way of interim order, initially till the filing of the reply by respondent No.2, and subsequently extended the said interim protection till the passing of the impugned order. It is further submitted that, in compliance with the directions issued by the investigating authority, the applicants have, on twelve separate occasions, appeared before the respondent, the Director of Revenue Intelligence, wherein their statements have been recorded. The applicants categorically state that they are not claiming ownership over the goods seized in the matter. The shipment discrepancy in question occurred exclusively due to an error at the supplier's end, and the applicants had no role, direct or indirect, in any alleged act of misdeclaration, which fact is evident from the requisitions and representations made by them to the concerned authorities.

2. The learned Counsel further submits that one of the Directors of the applicant company, who stands arrayed as a co-accused in the present case, has already been granted regular bail by the competent Court. The grounds and reasoning relied upon by the learned Additional Sessions Judge while rejecting the anticipatory bail application of the present applicants are not in consonance with the decision in *Radhika Agarwal versus Union of India and Others*, (2025) 150 GSTR 121.

3. By consent of the parties, stand over to **13 August 2025**.
There shall not be any coercive action against the applicants till
the next date.

(R.N. Laddha, J.)