



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.220 OF 2025
(Vijay Sukhdeo Chavan Vs. State of Maharashtra and anr.)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Mr. S.V. Sirpurkar, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. M.K. Pathan, APP for the State.

CORAM:- URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED :- APRIL 22, 2025.

Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.91/2025 registered with Police Station Ural, District Akola for the offences punishable under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, the applicant approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. The crime is registered against the present applicant on the basis of report lodged by Mohammad Riyaz Rahimuddin Pandey on an allegation that one Vijay Sukhdevrao Chavhan and police officials Sanjay Namdevrao Kumbhar etc. have demanded him amount of Rs.20,000/- for running his sand transportation business. Accordingly, the trap was arranged and the communication was recorded. The recitals of the FIR further shows that the said recording does not bear the voice of the present applicant. Moreover, the report is lodged after approximately five to six years of the incident.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that considering the statement in the FIR itself, the involvement of the present applicant becomes doubtful. The immediate custodial interrogation of the applicant is not required. In view of that, he be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the application and submitted that, considering the allegations which are in respect of the gratification amount, his custodial interrogation is required. In view of that, application deserves to be rejected.

5. I have heard learned Counsel for both the sides. Perused the recitals of the FIR. Admittedly, the FIR is lodged after five to six years of the incident. Moreover, the recitals of the FIR itself shows that it does not bear the voice of the present applicant. Now, the voice sample of the present applicant is also obtained by the investigating agency. Thus, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. In view of that, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, I proceed to pass following order:

(i) The application is allowed.

(ii) In the event of arrest, the applicant –
Vijay Sukhdeo Chavan in connection with

Crime No.91/2025 registered with Police Station Ural, District Akola for the offences punishable under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, be released on anticipatory bail, on executing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one solvent surety in the like amount.

(iii) The applicant shall attend the concerned police station as and when required for the investigation purpose and shall cooperate with the investigating agency.

(iv) The applicant shall not induce, threat or promise any witnesses who are acquainted with the facts of the case either personally or by way of electronic media.

6. The contravention of any of the condition would lead to the cancellation of bail.

7. The application stands disposed of.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)