



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 89 OF 2025

DINESH ARVIND BHANUSHALI AND OTHERS

...**VERSUS**...

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR. PSO, WASHIM CITY, TAH. AND DIST. WASHIM

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

Court's or Judge's order

Shri P.M.Pande, Advocate for applicants.
Shri N.B.Jawde, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM : **URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.**
DATE : **02nd MAY, 2025**

Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No. 772/2024 registered under Sections 303(2), 191(2), 190, 189(2), 117(2) of BNS, the applicants approached before this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. The learned counsel for the applicants seeks permission to withdraw the application as far as the applicant nos. 1 and 3 are concerned. He is permitted to withdraw the application as far as the applicant nos. 1 and 3 are concerned.

3. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the applicants that as far as the applicant no. 2 is concerned, there is specific allegations against him. The allegations against the applicants and other co-accused is that, on account of causing of some quarrel, the son of the informant was assaulted by the present applicants and the other co-accused, due to which, he sustained grievous injury, and the other prosecution witness then admitted him to the hospital. The learned counsel for the applicants submitted that the applicant no. 2 is though made an accused in

the said FIR but there is no specific allegations against him. Merely because of accompanying with the other applicants, he is implicated in the alleged offence. As far as the applicant no. 2 is concerned, his custodial interrogation is not required.

4. The learned APP for the State strongly opposed the present application on the ground that, on and before the incident, the son of the informant and the other prosecution witness were assaulted mercilessly by the non-applicants and therefore, their custodial interrogation is required. In view of that, the application deserves to be rejected.

5. On hearing both the sides and on perusal of the recitals of the FIR and the investigation papers, it reveals that as far as the applicant no. 2 is concerned, there is general allegation levelled against him. The application as to the applicant nos. 1 and 3 is already withdrawn by the learned counsel for the applicant(s). Considering the allegation levelled against the applicant no. 2, he has made out the case for grant of anticipatory bail. According, I proceed to pass the following order:-

ORDER

- i) The application is **allowed**.
- ii) The applicant no. 2 – Shri Gajanan Vithoba Bhisade shall be released on an anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in connection with Crime No. 772/2024 registered under Sections 303(2), 191(2), 190, 189(2), 117(2) of BNS, on executing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one solvent surety in the like amount.

- iii) The applicant no. 2 shall attend the concerned Police Station once in a week i.e. on Tuesday between 10.00 a.m. to 01.00 p.m. and shall co-operate with the investigating agency.
- iv) 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 electronic media.
- v) The contravention of any of the conditions would lead to the cancellation of bail.
- vi) Accordingly, the application stands **disposed of**.

6. The application is withdrawn against the applicant nos. 1 and 3, therefore, it is disposed of as against the applicant nos. 1 and 3.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)