



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 361 OF 2025

Yash s/o Manish Khillare Vs State of Maharashtra

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

Court's or Judge's Order

Mr. N.A. Parwani, counsel for applicant.

Mr. N.B. Jawade, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED : 04/07/2025.

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No. 98/2025 registered under Sections 132, 296, 3(5), 351(2), 351(3) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the applicant approached this Court for grant of anticipatory bail.

2. As per the allegation levelled against the present applicant on the basis of a report lodged by ASI Kishor Gopal Chandan on an allegation that he was deputed for controlling the traffic. On 20/03/2025, while discharging his duty, he found one blue-coloured Access vehicle near the new bus stand, which was parked in the area marked as "No Parking." Therefore, he intercepted the vehicle. The present applicant and one Sonu Ingle came there and raised a quarrel as to why their vehicle was being lifted, and thereafter, showed a knife to the constable, who was discharging

his official duty. On the basis of the said report, police have registered the crime against the present applicant.

3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, who submitted that as far as the allegations are concerned, they are baseless. Now, the applicant has already produced the knife before the investigating agency therefore, his custodial interrogation is concerned, which is not required. In view of that, he be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the said application and submitted that, considering the fact that the constable who was discharging the official duty was subjected for the harassment by the present applicant by showing the knife. In view of that, he is not entitled for any discretionary relief. In view of that, the application deserves to be rejected.

5. On hearing both sides and on perusal of the investigation papers, it reveals that the informant, who is the police officer, was discharging his official duty, and while he was discharging the official duty, the present applicant, who has committed an illegal act by parking the vehicle in the "No Parking" area, on taking action, showed the knife to the police officer. However, considering the fact that he was already protected by granting ad-interim protection and he has cooperated with the investigating agency and produced the knife before the investigating officer, therefore, no purpose

would be served by cancelling his ad-interim protection, in view of that, the application deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following order.

- a] Criminal Application is **allowed**.
- b] The interim protection granted to the present applicant by order dated 21/05/2025 is hereby confirmed, on the condition that the applicant shall attend the concerned police station once in a week on Tuesday between 10.00 a.m. to 01.00 p.m, and shall cooperate with the investigating agency.
- c] The applicant shall not indulge himself in similar type of the incidents.
- d] A single registration of offence would lead to the cancellation of bail.
- e] The applicant shall not induce, threat or promise any witnesses who are acquainted with the facts of the present case, either personally or by way of electronic media.

Criminal application is **disposed of**.

[URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.]