



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

920 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 290 OF 2026

TANVIR MOHAMMAD HANIF RANGREJ

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Syed G. R.

APP for Respondent/s-State : Mr. C. V. Bhadane.

...

CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.

DATE : 25.03.2026

PER COURT :-

1. Heard both sides.
2. The applicant is seeking bail in respect of offence bearing Crime No.964 of 2025, registered with Shirdi Police Station, District Ahilyanagar for the offences punishable under Sections 111, 189(2), 191(2), 191(3), 190, 351(2), 352, 126 of B.N.S. and Section 3, 25 of Arms Act.
3. It is submitted that applicant is arrested on 30.11.2025. Charge-sheet is filed on 26.02.2026. The allegations of the charge-sheet are that informant and his son were threatened, intimidated by the accused person at the relevant time and one of the perpetrators was having pistol. It is submitted that absolutely no incriminating role is attributed against the applicant and further detention is not required.

4. Learned APP submits that there are serious criminal antecedents of 14 cases against the present applicant. He is shown to be absconding in the criminal cases. He is stated to be habitual offender and not co-operating the police or the Court in earlier matters.

5. I have gone through First Information Report and the relevant papers of investigation. No incriminating role is attributed to the applicant except having been present at the relevant time in the car. He is not the person who is holding any weapon. *Prima facie* case is made out to enlarge him on bail.

6. There are serious offences registered against the applicant. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant makes a solemn statement that he is not the absconding accused in previous cases. The co-accused in couple of cases are absconding and no fault can be attributable to the applicant. There is no reason to discard the statement made across the bar.

7. Reliance is placed by learned counsel for the applicant on the judgment in *Prabhakar Tewari Vs. State of U.P. and*

Another ; 2020(1) SCC 648. Therefore, I pass the following order :

ORDER

- (i) Bail Application is allowed.
- (ii) Applicant **TANVIR MOHAMMAD HANIF RANGREJ** shall be released on bail in Crime No.964 of 2025, registered with Shirdi Police Station, District Ahilyanagar for the offences punishable under Sections 111, 189(2), 191(2), 191(3), 190, 351(2), 352, 126 of B.N.S. and Section 3, 25 of Arms Act on furnishing P. R. bond of Rs.30,000/- (Rupees thirty thousands only) with one solve surety of like amount on the following conditions :
 - (a) The applicant shall not contact the prosecution witnesses or tamper the prosecution evidence.
 - (b) If it is noticed that the statement made across the bar is incorrect that will entail cancellation of bail by permitting the stake holders to apply for cancellation of bail.
 - (c) The applicant shall co-operate the Investigating Officer for furnishing any information, if required.
- (iii) Bail application is disposed of accordingly.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)

...