



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.91 OF 2025

Vitthal s/o Rohidas Chavhan

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra, through PSO, PS Barshitakli Dist. Akola

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. N.D. Dawda, Counsel for the applicant.

Mr. M.K. Pathan, APP for the non-applicant State.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED : 18/03/2025

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.593/2024 registered at Police Station Barshitakli District Akola for the offence punishable under Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 the applicant approached this Court for grant of bail.
2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP for the State.
3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that the FIR is lodged on the basis of the report lodged by Sanjay Arjun Pawar on an allegation that marriage of his daughter was settled with the present applicant. He further submitted that the present applicant was demanding the dowry amount of Rs.20 lakhs and also obtained gold ring as well as the complainant has also incurred the expenses of Rs.1,50,000/- in the said marriage and thereafter,

the applicant has denied to perform the marriage. He submitted that only because the marriage is declined to be performed, therefore, the FIR is lodged against the present applicant. He submitted that there is no demand of dowry and custodial interrogation of the present is also not required.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the application and submitted that considering the statements of the independent witnesses, the involvement of the present applicant revealed. His custodial interrogation is required for recovery of the gold articles and therefore, the application deserves to be rejected.

5. On hearing both the sides and on perusal of the independent statements of the witnesses the involvement of the present applicant is revealed. At this stage, no case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail. In view of that the application deserves to be rejected. Accordingly I proceed to pass the following order.

ORDER

The application is rejected.

The application stands disposed of.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)