



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.618/2025

Ranjit s/o. Ramu Vaidhy Vs. State of Maharashtra and Anr.

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. P. M. Ukey, Advocate for the Applicant.
 Ms M. A. Barabde, A.P.P. for the Non-applicant/State.
 Mr. S. S. Dhone, Advocate (Appointed) for Non-applicant No.2.

CORAM : MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI,J.

DATED : 03/10/2025.

. Heard.

2. The applicant has apprehension of arrest in Crime No.143/2025 registered at Police Station Sihora, District Bhandara for the offences punishable under Sections 64(2)(1), 64(2)(m), 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 4 and 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

3. It is alleged that initially the crime under Section 137(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 came to be registered vide Crime No.143/2025 on the complaint lodged by the father of the victim. The victim appeared in the Police Station along with the applicant. At that time, she has not made any statement about sexual assault by the applicant upon the victim. Thereafter, she has given the statement about the sexual intercourse by the applicant for four times in agricultural land and near the railway track.

4. The learned Counsel for the applicant has stated that the victim has not made any allegation about sexual assault by this applicant in her statement and therefore, the crime of kidnapping was registered. Both of

them appeared before the Police Station and thereafter, the crime under Sections 64(2)(1), 64(2)(m) and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita is registered. The victim is more than 17 years of age. No sexual relations are established by this applicant. He is a labourer. Hence, prayed to protect him by granting anticipatory bail.

5. The learned A.P.P. opposed the application stating that the statement of the victim shows that she had sexual relations for four times and the applicant and his friend took her forcibly. The medical report supports it. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

6. Heard both the learned Counsel for the respective parties.

7. On perusal of the statement of the victim it appears that it is not out of love affair. The victim is 17 years of age. The applicant took her and he had forcible relations with her. The medical report supports the sexual intercourse by the applicant.

8. Considering the statement made by the victim and as the applicant denied the love affair with the victim, no case is made out to protect the applicant by granting anticipatory bail. Hence, the application is rejected.

9. The fees of the appointed Counsel on behalf of the non-applicant No.2 be quantified as per Rules.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)