



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

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 578 OF 2025**

Dipak Manohar Pawar 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. Bhushan Dafle, counsel for applicant.

Mr. V.A.Thakre, APP for non-applicant/State

**CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.**

**DATED : 21/08/2025.**

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No. 61 of 2025 registered with Police Station Ural, Tq. and District Akola for the offence punishable under Section 303(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the applicant approached this court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, who submitted that the crime was registered based on a report lodged by the informant, alleging theft of a transformer and aluminum wire, approximately 3000 meters worth Rs. 50,000/- and another aluminum wire of 1800 meters worth Rs. 30,000/-, fixed to another transformer. He submitted that initially, a crime was registered against unknown persons. As far as the applicant is concerned, he had no involvement in the said act and was not present at the crime scene. His involvement is alleged merely on suspicion based on the

statement of the co-accused. As far as his custodial interrogation is concerned, it is not required, as the entire material has already been seized from the co-accused. In view of that, he be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

3. Learned APP strongly opposed for the same and invited my attention towards the pleading of the present applicant before the Sessions Court in para-2, wherein he has mentioned that the present applicant has no criminal stigma up till now. However, it has been brought to the Court's notice that offences of a similar nature have already been registered against the applicant, and he has been shown as a suspect in those cases.

4. He submitted that it is further mentioned in para-4 in the application that the applicant is working as Mukdam, and he provides the labour to the said company. The said company takes contracts from MSEDCL for dismantling the high-tension lines. The applicant transports labor to the workplace in hired vehicles. At the relevant time, the company was engaged in work at Loni Takli, Amravati, specifically dismantling high-tension lines of MSEDCL as assigned by Reliable Enterprises. He submitted that the pleading itself is sufficient to establish his presence at the spot for engaging the labourers. The investigation is ongoing. He further submitted that similar types of offences have

been committed against the present applicant, and therefore, custodial interrogation is necessary.

5. On hearing both sides and on perusal of the investigation papers, it reveals that the applicant was shown to be a suspect in the said crime. The investigation is at a prime stage, and the alleged theft involves significant material worth of Rs. 70,000/- (3000 meters and 1800 meters of wire). Considering the pleading of the present applicant in the application, which was filed before the Sessions Court, shows his connection with the alleged activities.

6. In view of the above facts and circumstances, at this stage, his custodial interrogation is required, and therefore, the application deserves to be rejected. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following order.

The criminal application **stands rejected**.

[URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.]