



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF BAIL NO. 236 OF 2025

**CHANDRAKANT SHANTARAM TAYDE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER**

...
Advocate for Applicant : Adv. Chaudhari Akshaya Sanjeev
APP for Respondents/State : Mr. N. S. Tekale
...

**CORAM : MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.
DATE : 6th FEBRUARY 2026**

PER COURT :

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the Applicant and the learned APP for the State.
2. The Applicant has approached this Court, seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail of the accused Respondent No.2 herein, who was granted bail vide order dated 02.12.2025 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalgaon.
3. The learned Counsel for the Applicant submits that Respondent No.2 is alleged to have committed serious offences of extortion by threatening with a dangerous weapon, namely a revolver. Looking to the gravity of the offences, the learned trial Court erred in exercising discretion under Section 482 for grant of anticipatory bail, without properly considering the seriousness of the

offence and the threats posed by the accused to the Applicant.

. The learned Counsel further submits that, taking into consideration the observations of the learned trial Court in the order dated 02.12.2025, it is evident that the learned Additional Sessions Judge failed to appreciate the allegations made in the FIR. The prosecution has also stated that the revolver allegedly pointed towards the complainant is yet to be recovered. However still the learned Sessions Judge allowed the anticipatory bail application by confirming the interim order.

4. I have gone through the impugned order dated 02.12.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge. A perusal of the order shows that the learned Trial Court considered the allegations made in the FIR, wherein it is alleged that the complainant was called by the Applicant to a petrol pump for the purpose of purchasing plots and was threatened by showing a firearm, and was asked to tell Jayshree to seek a divorce from her husband. It is further alleged that the complainant was compelled to transfer Rs.2,000/- by online mode to the mobile number of the Applicant. The firearm was allegedly shown from the pocket of the pant, attached to his waist.

. Taking into consideration the allegations in the FIR, interim relief was granted to Respondent No.2/accused, directing him to attend the police station and cooperate with the investigation on specified dates. It is observed by the learned Sessions Court that Respondent No.2 attended the police station on the given dates, and

there is no record in the case diary to show that he was thereafter called again or that he failed to cooperate. The prosecution, however, states that the accused has failed to hand over the revolver allegedly used by him on the date of the incident.

5. The perusal of the impugned order dated 02.12.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge shows that the learned trial Court considered the allegations made in the FIR. The FIR itself shows that the complainant himself was not sure whether the revolver, which was not even pointed at him, was merely kept in the pocket of the pant of the accused, attached to his waist and the complainant also appeared unsure whether the said revolver was real or a plastic toy. The learned trial Court has therefore observed that, taking into consideration the allegations in the FIR, the compliance of the accused with the interim order, and after going through the investigation papers, discretion under Section 482 of the BNSS was exercised for confirming the interim order dated 12.11.2025, thereby releasing Respondent No.2 on anticipatory bail.

6. It is almost a settled law that the scope for interference in matters of cancellation of bail, where the accused has been released after due application of mind by the Trial Court, is very limited. It is only in the event of any supervening circumstances that the superior Court can intervene in the order releasing the accused on bail. No such circumstance or subsequent conduct of the accused has been brought to the notice of this Court, nor is there any material to show

that the accused extended threats which could have caused prejudice to the prosecution case. Thus, in the absence of any material to show that the accused has violated any of the conditions, I am not inclined to interfere with the well-reasoned order dated 02.12.2025, wherein the learned Sessions Court exercised its discretion to release the accused on bail.

7. The application for cancellation of bail is therefore rejected and disposed of accordingly.

MEHROZ K. PATHAN
JUDGE

NAJEEB..