



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 370/2025

(Ramesh Panjab Shinde Vs. The State of Maharashtra)

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. P.V. Navlani, Advocate for applicant.
 Ms. S. Dhote, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM: URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.

DATED : 11/06/2025.

Heard.

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of Police in connection with Crime No. 173/2025 registered under Sections 109(1), 118(1), 115(2) and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ("BNSS"), the applicant approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. The crime is registered on the basis of report lodged by Kashinath Rama Tambe on 16.04.2025, on an allegation that applicant is the husband of the sister of his daughter-in-law Radha Ramesh Tambe. The applicant is having illicit relationship with the daughter-in-law of the complainant. Therefore, the complainant and his son given understanding to the applicant and his wife on several occasions. On the said issue, there was dispute taken place between the applicant and the complainant and his daughter-in-law on several occasions. On the day of the incident at about 10.00 a.m. in the morning, the complainant along with his

grandson, daughter-in-law and son were present in the house. It is alleged that the applicant along with his wife and two sons entered in the house of complainant and abused him in filthy language, given threats and thereafter assaulted him, due to which the informant as well as the other family members have sustained the grievous injuries. On the basis of said report, the Police have registered the crime against the present applicant.

3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant who submitted that due to the previous dispute, the alleged incident has taken place. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant was not present at the spot of the incident. He is implicated falsely in the alleged incident. The CCTV Footage shows the presence of the applicant at somewhere else. As far as the custodial interrogation is concerned, which is not required and therefore, he be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed said application and invited my attention towards the investigation papers which shows that the eye-witnesses have specifically attributed the role to the present applicant. He has used the weapon like axe while assaulting the injured wife of Suresh Pandurang Shinde. She has sustained the grievous injuries due to the said blow. Thus, considering the prima facie material and specific role attributed to the present applicant, she prays for rejection of the present application.

5. After hearing both the sides and on perusal of the investigation papers, it reveals that the alleged incident has occurred out of the previous dispute on account of illicit relationship between the present applicant and the daughter-in-law of the complainant. The statement of the eye-witnesses shows the involvement of the present applicant assigning role that he has given a blow by means of axe due to which the injured Shobha Suresh Shinde has received a grievous injury on the vital part of the body.

6. Considering the statement of eye-witness which substantiated by the Medical Certificate, the custodial interrogation of the present applicant is also required for the purpose of seizure of the axe. In view of that, the application deserves to be rejected and I proceed to pass the following order.

(I) Application is rejected.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)