



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 451 OF 2025

Shrinivas Vyenkatesh Kottawadlawar and Anr.

Vs.

State of Maharashtra, Through Range Forest Officer, Range Forest Office
Aheri, District Gadchiroli

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. M.A. Deo, Advocate for the applicant/s.

Mr. Neeraj Jawade, APP for the non-applicant/State.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.

DATED : 17/07/2025

1. Learned Counsel for the applicants not pressed the application for applicant No.1.

2. As far as the applicant No.2 is concerned he is arraigned as an accused in connection with P.O.R. No.02/2025 registered by the Range Forest Office, Aheri, District Gadchiroli for the offence punishable under Sections 41(2)(b,c), 42, 53, 69 of the Indian Forest Act, 1927 read with Rule 31 of the Maharashtra Forest Rules, 2014 and Rule 66 of the Bombay Forest Rules, 1942, therefore, the applicant No.2 approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

3. Heard learned Counsel for the applicants, who submitted that, as per the allegations, the applicants were found in possession of Timber illegally which belongs to the Forest, and therefore, he along with his father was arraigned as an accused.

He submitted that as far as the present applicant No.2 is concerned, he is not the owner of the furniture mart. Merely because he is the son of the applicant No.1, he is implicated in the alleged offence. He used to look after the work of the furniture mart in absence of his father. Thus, as far as his role is concerned, there is no specific attribution in the report. In view of that, he be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the said application and submitted that Forest products found in possession of the present applicant No.2, and therefore, his custodial interrogation is required.

5. On hearing both sides and on perusal of the recitals of the FIR, it reveals that, the entire Timber is already seized, moreover, it was found in the house of the present applicant, but the entire transaction is looked after by the applicant No.1, who has already not pressed the application. As far as the applicant No.2 is concerned, only in absence of his father, he is looking after the day-to-day activities of the furniture mart. In view of that, the prayer of the applicant No.2 for grant of anticipatory bail deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following Order :-

ORDER

- (i) The application is partly allowed.
- (ii) The application for grant of anticipatory bail by the applicant No.1 is not pressed and

therefore, it is disposed of to the extent of the applicant No.1.

(iii) The applicant No.2 **Rohit Shrinivas Kottawadlawar** shall be released on anticipatory bail in the event of the arrest, in connection with P.O.R. No.02/2025 registered by the Range Forest Aheri Region, District Gadchiroli for the offence punishable under Sections 41(2)(b,c), 42, 53, 69 of the Indian Forest Act, 1927 read with Rule 31 of the Maharashtra Forest Rules, 2014 and Rule 66 of the Bombay Forest Rules, 1942, on executing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one solvent surety in the like amount.

(iv) The applicant No.2 shall attend the Range Forest Office, Aheri, District Gadchiroli, as and when required for the investigation purpose on issuance of the notice in advance of seven days.

(v) The applicant No.2 shall not induce, threat or promise any witnesses who are acquainted with the facts of the case, either personally or by way of any electronic media.

(vi) The applicant No. 2 shall not indulge himself in similar type of activities and single registration of the offence would lead to the cancellation of bail.

(vii) The applicant No.2 shall not tamper with the registers and any other documents which is maintained in their shop.

The application is disposed of.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)