

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

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 2080 of 2025

Veerappan Ravi @ Dhanush Ravi

Age 25, Occ. Business,

R/at. House No.1503, Swami

Nagar, Ambernath (W), Dist. Thane.

... Applicant

versus

The State of Maharashtra

(At the instance of Police Inspector,

Ambernath Police Station, Ambernath (W),

C.R. No.I 0266/2025)

...Respondent

Mr Mahesh Funde, for the Applicant.

Mr Shahaji Shinde, 'B' Panel Counsel a/w Mr Prashant Jadhav,
APP, for Respondent / State.

API Subhash Pansare, Ambernath Police Station, is present.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.

Date: 28 July 2025

P.C.:

This is an application for pre-arrest bail filed by the applicant, who is apprehending arrest in connection with CR No.266 of 2025, registered at Ambernath Police Station, Thane City, for offences punishable under Section 109, 118(1), and 118(2) read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The prosecution alleges that in the early hours of 18 March 2025, at approximately 1:40 a.m., the informant, accompanied by his father and a neighbour, was returning home on a motorcycle after visiting Central Hospital in Ulhasnagar. While they were travelling along with Kalyan-Ambernath Road, they were ambushed near Gate No.02 of the Ordnance Factory by the applicant and the co-accused. According to the allegations, the applicant and his accomplices, acting with intent to commit murder, brutally assaulted the trio with wooden sticks. The attack was specifically directed at vital parts of the victim's bodies resulting in grievous injuries that required urgent and substantial medical treatment.

3. The learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant asserts the applicant's innocence and contends that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the crime. He submits that the injuries sustained by the informant and his companions are, in fact, minor and do not support the prosecution's claim of a murderous assault. He argues that the co-accused, Prakash, whose alleged involvement is on par with that of the applicant, has already been granted bail. Moreover, there is no recovery or incriminating material sought from the applicant, and he poses no threat to the investigation. The applicant is willing to comply with any terms and conditions that this Court

may deem fit to impose.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent/ State opposes the applicant's request for pre-arrest bail and contends that there is a history of hostility between the informant and the applicant's families. The applicant, in active connivance with the co-accused, launched a brutal and premeditated assault on the informant and his companions with the intent to kill. The assailants used wooden sticks to inflict repeated and forceful blows, resulting in multiple injuries on the head and face, including the fracture injuries. The learned APP further submits that the investigation, in relation to the applicant, is still at a nascent stage. Key elements of the investigation, including, but not limited to, the recovery of the weapon used in the commission of the offence, remain pending. In view of the seriousness of the allegations and the nature of the injuries sustained, he contends that custodial interrogation of the applicant is imperative for uncovering the full extent of the conspiracy and for ensuring a fair and thorough investigation. Moreover, the learned APP expresses concern that granting pre-arrest bail at this juncture may adversely impact the investigation and there is credible apprehension that the applicant, if granted pre-arrest bail, may tamper with evidence or exert influence over material witnesses. In light of

these circumstances, he submits that the applicant is not entitled to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail at this stage.

5. This Court has given anxious consideration to the rival contentions and perused the records.

6. It is a settled position in law that the power to grant anticipatory bail is extraordinary and must be used with caution and discretion, based on the specific facts of each case. Unlike regular bail, it cannot be treated as a general rule. Courts must avoid a one-size-fits-all approach, as granting such pre-arrest bail in serious cases may affect the investigation. These aspects are also highlighted in the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Srikant Upadhyay & Ors. Vs State of Bihar & Anr.*, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 282.

7. A bare perusal of the records reveals that the applicant is *prima facie* implicated as an active participant in the alleged offence. It is specifically alleged that, the applicant, in connivance with the co-accused, carried out a brutal and premeditated assault on the informant and his associates using wooden sticks, as weapons, with the evident intent to cause grievous harm and endanger their lives. The FIR categorically identifies the applicant as one of the principal assailants. The

severity of assault is reflected in the nature of injuries sustained by two individuals, including multiple fractures to the cranial and facial regions. This level of violence *prima faice* suggests a deliberate and targetted attack, rather than a spontaneous altercation. It further appears that there exists a history of animosity and long standing disputes between the applicant's family and that of the informant, which lends weight to the possibility of motive behind the commission of the offence. The material available on record at this preliminary stage, indicates the applicant's direct involvement in the alleged crime. Notably, the weapon purportedly used in the assault by the applicant is yet to be recovered. The investigation in respect of the applicant is at a nascent stage, and there is a possibility that the applicant may tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses. Releasing the applicant at this stage would hinder the course of an effective investigation.

8. Considering the gravity of the accusations, the nature of the injuries caused, and the nascent stage of the investigation so far as the present applicant is concerned, this Court is not inclined to exercise its discretion in favour of the applicant. Accordingly, the application stands rejected.

[R.N. Laddha, J.]