



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION(ABA) NO.820 OF 2025

Mahadev Ukanda Dhandare Vs. State of Maharashtra and anr.

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Mr.N.R.Tekade,counsel for the applicant.
Ms.M.A.Barabde, APP for the State.
Ms.Sapna Jadhav, appointed counsel for the non
applicant No.2

CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 11/12/2025

1. This is an application filed by the applicant for grant of anticipatory bail in connection with Crime No. 712/2025 registered on 06.09.2025 with the Police Station Khadan, district Akola for the offence punishable under sections 74 and 115(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,2023 and sections 8 and 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

2. The prosecution case in brief is that, on 05.09.2025, the informant lodged the First Information Report. Victim is her 15 years old daughter. Elder daughter of informant is married and resides at some distance. There was Bhandara (Mahaprasad) arranged in the evening of

05.09.2025 by Ganesh Mandal. After taking meal, the victim returned home around 10.00 p.m. She was crying. She told that, Mahadev came from behind and touched her cheek with ill-intention. He asked her to go with him. When she confronted him about his acts, he slapped her. At that time, elder sister of the victim confronted him. He gave her push and went away. The First Information Report was registered.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant has stated that considering the allegations made, the sexual intention is not there. The custodial interrogation is not required, hence prayed to protect him by granting anticipatory bail.

4. The learned APP has opposed the application stating that the incident took place in the presence of her elder sister. He touched her cheek in public with sexual intention and asked her to go with him at lonely place. Considering the act of the applicant, the custodial interrogation is necessary. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the non applicant No.2 has opposed the application stating that the act of the applicant is with sexual intention and therefore, his custody is required. Hence prayed to reject the application.

6. Heard both the sides.

7. The allegations are about touching the cheek of 15 years old girl and asking her to go with him is with sexual intention. When she refused, he slapped her. The act of applicant comes under the sexual assault by the applicant. Considering his act to prevent him from doing such activities, custodial interrogation is necessary. Hence, the application stands rejected and disposed of.

8. Fees of the appointed counsel be paid as per rules.

JUDGE