



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 542 OF 2025

Siddharth Bhaskar Rangari

Vs.

State of Maharashtra, through Police Station Officer, Police Station,
Ballarshah, District Chandrapur

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. A. R. Fule, Counsel for the applicant.
Mr. Amit Madiwale, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED : 07/08/2025

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.462/2025 registered with Police Station Ballarshah, District Chandrapur for the offence punishable under Sections 123, 318(4), 336(2) (3), 340(2), 49 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under Sections 65(a), 83 of the Maharashtra Prohibition Act, the applicant approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. Heard learned Counsel for the applicant who submitted that the crime is registered on the basis of report lodged by API Deepak Namdeorao Kankredwar on an allegation that he received a secret information as to the transportation of illicit liquor, accordingly, he intercepted two vehicles i.e. one Scorpio bearing No. MH-34-CJ-6576 and TATA

Altroz bearing No.MH-34-CJ-7337. On interception of the vehicle, the illicit liquor worth of Rs.23,50,520/- along with the vehicles were seized. He submitted that as far as the present applicant is concerned, who was not found at the spot. As per the allegations of the complainant, he fled away from the spot of incident. Neither the vehicles are owned by him nor the said illicit liquor. Now the stock is already recovered and therefore, his custodial interrogation is not required.

3. Learned APP strongly opposed the said application and submitted that the applicant has not cooperated with the investigating agency. He has not disclosed who is the owner of the said stock and owner of the vehicle. Thus, he is not cooperating with the investigating agency. There are criminal antecedents of a similar nature. In view of that, the application deserves to be rejected.

4. On hearing both sides and on perusal of the recitals of the FIR, it reveals that two vehicles were intercepted and from them, the illicit liquor was seized by the police. As far as the involvement of the present applicant is concerned, it reveals from the recitals of the FIR that he fled away from the spot of incident. As far as the custody is concerned, it is not required as the entire stock is already recovered. The contention raised by the learned APP can also be taken into consideration by imposing the condition on

the applicant and therefore, the interim protection granted to the present applicant deserves to be confirmed by imposing certain conditions. In view of that I proceed to pass following order:

ORDER

- (i) The application is allowed.
- (ii) The interim protection granted to the present applicant by order dated 22.07.2025 is hereby confirmed on condition that the applicant shall attend the concerned Police Station twice in a week on Sunday and Thursday between between 10.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. and shall cooperate with the investigating agency in a positive manner.
- (iii) The applicant shall not indulge himself in similar types of the activities and single registration of the offence would lead to the cancellation of bail.
- (iv) The applicant shall not induce, threat or promise any witnesses who are acquainted with the facts of the case.

The application is disposed of.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)