

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

Anticipatory Bail Application No.2331 of 2025

Rehan Dilawar Tamboli

Age: 19 yrs, Occ: Student,

R/at Suya Nagari, MIDC, Baramati,

Tal: Baramati, District-Pune.

Applicant/

... Accused No.5.

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra

Through Baramati Police Station

... Respondent.

Mr Kuldeep Nikam for the applicant.

Mr PP Jadhav, APP for the respondent / State.

PSI Dipali Gaikwad, Baramati Police Station, Pune Rural.

Coram : R.N.Laddha, J.

Date : 25 August 2025.

P.C. :

. By this application, the applicant seeks pre-arrest bail in connection with CR No.231 of 2025, registered at Baramati Police Station, Pune Rural, for offences punishable under Sections 308(4), 118(2), 189(2), 189(4), 190, 191(3), 191(2), 351(2), 351(3), 352, 113(2) and 120(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. According to the prosecution, the co-accused, Sahil

Londhe and Pravin Bhapkar, initially demanded Rs.50,000/- from the informant's brother, Rohit, threatening to prevent the brothers from using the wrestling training centre. The family refused to pay, as the centre was open to the public without a fee. A month later, on 14 June 2025, the informant and his brother were returning home when they were once again confronted by Sahil, along with one Akshay. When the informant's brother again refused to pay, they, along with Pappu Kamble and four other unidentified individuals, assaulted them. During the attack, the assailants used hockey sticks and a stone, injuring the informant's brother. The role attributed to the applicant is that he threw a stone at the informant's brother, causing injury.

3. Mr Kuldeep Nikam, the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant, asserting the applicant's innocence, contends that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the crime. He submits that the applicant is not named in the FIR and no overt act has been attributed to him. The applicant and the informant knew each other, a fact admitted by him in an affidavit filed before the Sessions Court; yet the informant did not implicate him while lodging the crime, which itself falsifies the prosecution's

case against the applicant. The learned Counsel further submits that the recovery of the alleged weapons has been done at the instance of the co-accused, who have already been released on bail. The injuries sustained are of a simple nature. The investigation is complete, and there is nothing to be recovered or discovered at the applicant's behest. The applicant has no criminal antecedents and is ready and willing to abide by any conditions imposed by this Court.

4. Mr Prashant Jadhav, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent/ State, contends that the offence is of a grave and serious nature. He submits that the applicant threw a stone at the informant's brother, causing injuries. On instructions, he submits that the investigation is complete, and a charge sheet will be filed shortly. However, he raises concerns about potential evidence tampering and witness influence if the applicant is granted pre-arrest bail.

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

6. Upon perusal of the material placed on record, and in

particular the contents of the FIR, it is evident that there are no direct allegations attributed to the present applicant. The FIR, as registered, does not name the applicant as an accused, nor does it disclose his involvement in the commission of the alleged offence. It is a matter of record that the applicant was known to the first informant; yet, despite such acquaintance, the applicant was not implicated at the initial stage of registration of the crime.

7. It is further significant to note that the weapons allegedly used in the commission of the offence have already been recovered from the co-accused, all of whom have since been enlarged on bail. There remains, therefore, no necessity for custodial interrogation of the applicant, as nothing is required to be recovered or discovered at his instance.

8. The record also reveals that the investigation has been completed, and the prosecution is in the process of filing the charge sheet. The apprehension of the prosecution that the applicant may tamper with the evidence and influence witnesses can be taken care of by imposing appropriate conditions.

9. In light of the foregoing circumstances, and considering the settled principles governing the exercise of discretion under Section 482 of the BNSS, this Court finds it a fit case to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicant. Hence, the following order:

ORDER

- (i) In the event of the applicant's arrest in CR No.231 of 2025, registered at Baramati Police Station, Pune Rural, he shall be released on bail upon executing a PR Bond of Rs.25,000/- and furnishing one or more sureties in the like amount.
- (ii) The applicant, himself or through any other person, shall not tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses.
- (iii) The applicant shall attend the concerned Police Station as and when required by the investigating officer until the filing of the charge sheet.

6. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

[R. N. Laddha, J.]