

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.2570 OF 2025

Raj Lilaram Chandwani

... Applicant

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

**WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.3620 OF 2025
IN
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.2570 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.3467 OF 2025
IN
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.2570 OF 2025**

Mr. Aabad Ponda, Senior Advocate a/w Mr. Ishwar Nankani a/w Mr. Jagdish Choudhary, Ms. Rhea Sinkar a/w Ms. Prajakta Sawardekar & Mr. Saurabh Kewalramani i/by M/s. Nankani & Associates for the Applicant.

Mr. V. N. Sagare, APP for the Respondent-State.

Mr. Purshottam Khanchandani (Party in person) a/w Monish Bhatia, Sparsh Khanchandani a/w Khushboo G a/w Barkha M. a/w Rajesh R. for the Intervener in IAs.

API H. M. Kulkarni, Vitthalwadi PS is present.

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.

DATE : 22ND DECEMBER 2025

PC. :

1. This is an Application for anticipatory bail.
2. The Applicant is apprehending his arrest in Crime No.600 of 2025 registered with Vitthalwadi Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 108, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The Applicant is Accused No.4 in the aforesaid crime. The deceased was an Advocate. It is the case of the prosecution that on 27th August 2025 at about 11.30 p.m., the deceased had met Accused No.1 at her residence as she had called the deceased multiple times to resolve certain issues. The deceased returned home at around 12.30 a.m. and told the first informant that a quarrel had taken place between her and Accused Nos.1, 2 and 3. However, the same was later settled amongst themselves. On 28th August 2025, the first informant saw a video of the said quarrel being circulated on WhatsApp groups, due to which the deceased was mentally distressed. Thereafter, upon visiting Vitthalwadi Police Station at around 11.00 a.m., the deceased told the first informant that Accused Nos.1 and 2 were lodging an FIR against her regarding the said quarrel. Subsequently, at about 12.00 p.m., the deceased committed suicide by jumping off the 7th floor of the building Roma Apartments at Ulhasnagar. On 30th August 2025, upon checking the CCTV footage of the deceased's office, it was found that the deceased had written a suicide note, wherein she had mentioned the names of the present Applicant and other co-accused as the persons responsible for her death.

4. I have heard Learned Senior Counsel for the Applicant, Learned APP for the Respondent-State and the first informant in person.

5. Learned Counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant is an Advocate. It is submitted that the name of the Applicant is vaguely mentioned in the suicide note, without any specific allegations. It is submitted that the Applicant has nothing to do with the alleged suicide by the deceased. It is submitted that the chain of events leading to the suicide

by the deceased, evidently point at the quarrel that ensued between co-accused and the deceased in the afternoon as well as on the night of 27th August 2025. It is submitted that there is no material to show any positive action on the part of the Applicant proximate to the time of occurrence, which led the deceased to commit suicide. It is submitted that there is no need of custodial interrogation of the Applicant and the Applicant is ready and willing to cooperate in the investigation. It is thus submitted that the Applicant may be released on anticipatory bail.

6. On the other hand, Learned APP for the Respondent-State submits that the Applicant is involved in a serious crime. It is submitted that the deceased has specifically mentioned the name of the Applicant in her suicide note. It is further submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, custodial interrogation of the Applicant is necessary. It is submitted that considering the nature of crime, the Applicant may not be released on anticipatory bail.

7. The first informant in person submits that the present Applicant had lodged multiple false complaints against the deceased and her family before various courts for the purpose of defaming and harassing the deceased. It is submitted that the deceased was running an NGO for environmental causes and recognised by the Limca Book of Records as a national record holder for conducting an event, namely the 'Largest No-Honking Rally'. It is submitted that the Applicant has filed frivolous complaints with the Limca Book of Records Authority, with an attempt to discredit and defame the deceased and her daughter. It is further submitted that on 07th October 2022, the Applicant had brutally assaulted

the first informant in the Kalyan Court premises as well as threatened to kill him. It is further submitted that the Applicant is involved in multiple criminal cases and he has not disclosed about the said criminal cases in the present Application.

8. I have perused the FIR and other material placed on record including the alleged suicide note left by the deceased. The said suicide note reads thus:

“Jiya Goplani, Ulhas Falke, Dhananjay Bodare, Shivani Shukla, Adv. Raj Chandwani are responsible for my death. I have not done any wrong. I have not taken any money. I have not done injustice to Jiya Goplani. I have not taken single rupee from any Mandal, any neta, Jiya Goplani & Ulhas falke are framing me false above mentioned have mentally tortured to reach level to give my life.”

9. The material on record shows that the Applicant had filed multiple criminal cases against the deceased, due to which she was mentally disturbed. Thus, at this stage, it cannot be said that there is no material against the Applicant to infer abetment. Considering the nature of crime, I am not inclined to release the Applicant on anticipatory bail. Hence, the Anticipatory Bail Application is rejected.

10. The Interim Applications stand disposed of.

11. Learned Counsel for the Applicant submits that to enable the Applicant to approach the Hon’ble Supreme Court against the present order, the interim order dated 15th October 2025 passed by this Court protecting the Applicant from arrest be continued for a period of two weeks.

12. The Learned APP submits that considering the nature of crime, the interim order may not be continued.

13. However, as the Applicant wants to approach the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the interim order passed by this Court dated 15th October 2025 shall remain in operation for a period of two weeks.

(N.R. BORKAR, J.)