



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2190 OF 2025

Rahul Alias Bunty Dilip Bhingardive
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra

- ...
- Ms. S. G. Sonawane, Advocate for Applicant
 - Mr. K. K. Naik, APP for Respondent – State
 - Mr. S. S. Tone, Advocate for the Informant

...
WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 47 OF 2026
IN ABA/2190/2025

...
CORAM : MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.

DATED : 28.01.2026

PER COURT :

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned APP as also learned counsel for the informant.
2. The applicant has approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No. 1014 of 2025, registered on 02.11.2025 with Kotwali Police Station, Ahmednagar, Taluka and District Ahmednagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 140(2), 308(5) read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
3. The case of the prosecution is that the informant, along with his friends, was proceeding in a Bolero vehicle to visit a temple. Accused Nos. 1 to 4 arrived in another vehicle, forcibly made the

informant sit in their vehicle, threatened him, and took him to Sinnar. Accused No. 4, namely Ganesh Borude, assaulted the complainant with a sickle on his left wrist and back and demanded an amount of Rs. 20,00,000/-, stating that the said demand was made at the behest of the present applicant – Rahul alias Bunty Dilip Bhingardive. Consequently, the FIR came to be registered against the present applicant and other accused persons for the aforesaid offences at Kotwali Police Station.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is arrayed as an accused only on the basis of the statement of a co-accused, which is not an admissible piece of evidence. It is further submitted that the applicant has rivalry with the complainant and has been falsely roped in the present crime. The informant has several criminal cases registered against him. One of the absconding accused, Ganesh Borude, is a friend of both the informant and the applicant and, therefore, merely on suspicion, the applicant has been involved in the present crime. There is no material to connect the applicant with the alleged offence. Other accused persons have already been arrested. The applicant is ready to cooperate with the investigation and will not flee from justice. Except for one offence under Section 326 of the IPC, in which the applicant has already been granted anticipatory bail, there are no criminal antecedents. Hence, prayer is

made for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. As against this, learned APP as well as learned counsel for the informant vehemently oppose the application on the ground that the applicant is a habitual offender and has criminal antecedents, including an offence of bodily injury registered in the year 2012 under Section 326 of the IPC. The applicant is specifically named in the FIR by the complainant Nevin Sanjay Mane. The allegations are corroborated by the statements of witnesses Prathamesh Kale and Raju Kurhade. The Call Detail Records (CDR) of the present applicant and absconding accused Ganesh Borude show communication between them at the relevant time. The injury certificate reveals that the complainant sustained five Contused Lacerated Wounds (CLWs). The offence is serious in nature involving allegations of extortion, dacoity, kidnapping for ransom, and assault with a dangerous weapon, which are punishable with death or imprisonment for life. Hence, this is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

6. I have perused the investigation papers produced by the learned APP. The FIR itself reveals that the applicant is specifically named as the main conspirator in the offence of kidnapping for ransom. The main accused, Ganesh Borude, is alleged to have assaulted the complainant with a sickle. There are eye-witnesses to the incident, namely Prathamesh Kale and Raju Kurhade, who have

narrated the incident in detail. Witness Pramod has also spoken about the kidnapping incident in his presence, wherein the complainant was abducted by accused Ganesh Borude, Krushna Padale, and Mauli Pawar. The injury certificate shows that the complainant Nevin Sanjay Mane sustained five Contused Lacerated Wounds (CLWs). Though the said injuries are simple in nature and not on vital parts of the body, they corroborate the allegations made in the FIR. The Call Detail Records (CDR) of the applicant further indicate telephonic contact between the applicant and absconding accused Ganesh Borude at the relevant time. The applicant also has one criminal antecedent being Crime No. 129 of 2012 registered with Bhingar Camp Police Station, Ahilyanagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 326, 323, 504, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code. Thus, there is sufficient material on record to connect the applicant with the present crime.

7. Considering the gravity of the offence, which is punishable with death or imprisonment for life, I am not inclined to exercise the discretion under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita for grant of anticipatory bail. Hence, the anticipatory bail application is rejected. In view of the above, Criminal Application No. 47 of 2026 is also disposed of.

(MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.)