



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 539 OF 2026

Sangram Raosaheb Suryawanshi

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

...

- Mr. Akshay G. Mulange, Advocate h/f. Mr. J. V. Patil, Advocate for Applicant
- Mr. K. K. Naik, APP for Respondents - State

...

CORAM : MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.

DATED : 05.05.2026

**PER COURT :**

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the respondent-State.
2. The applicant has approached this Court apprehending arrest in connection with FIR No.48 of 2026 dated 04.02.2026 registered with Karjat Police Station, District Ahilyanagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 308(5) and 351(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
3. The prosecution story, in brief, is that the complainant Mr. G. S. Bagal is a practising Advocate at Karjat since the year 1998. He was appointed as a Court Commissioner in Regular Darkhast No.01 of 2017 pertaining to a partition dispute. After conducting the necessary proceedings, the complainant submitted his report before the

competent authority and accordingly the Tahsildar, Karjat effected partition of the concerned property.

4. It is alleged that on 04.02.2026 at about 10:56 a.m., when the complainant was proceeding towards the Court at Karjat, the applicant contacted him on his mobile phone and accused him of wrongly effecting partition of the land. When the complainant informed the applicant that the partition was effected by the Tahsildar in accordance with law, the applicant allegedly abused him in filthy language and threatened to kill him by chopping off his hands and legs.

5. It is further alleged that on the same day at about 02:03 p.m., the applicant again contacted the complainant on his mobile phone and demanded an amount of Rs.12,00,000/- for settlement of the issue and further threatened to kill him in the Court premises if the demand was not fulfilled. The complainant allegedly recorded the telephonic conversation in his mobile phone. As the complainant and his family members were frightened due to the threats extended by the applicant, the present FIR came to be lodged.

6. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present crime only with an intention to wreak vengeance. It is submitted that the applicant has never threatened the complainant. The applicant is a permanent

resident of village Gurav Pimpri, Taluka Karjat, District Ahilyanagar, has deep roots in society, and is not a flight risk. It is further submitted that the applicant has no criminal antecedents and is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Court. According to the learned counsel, custodial interrogation of the applicant is not necessary as the transcripts of the alleged telephonic conversation between the complainant and the applicant are already collected by the investigating agency. It is submitted that no fruitful purpose would be served by custodial interrogation and that the investigation can be completed without taking the applicant in custody. Hence, the applicant may be protected by granting anticipatory bail.

7. Per contra, learned APP strongly opposes the present application on the ground that the mobile number of the applicant is specifically mentioned in the First Information Report and there are specific allegations that the applicant threatened the complainant for submitting the Court Commissioner's report in the partition proceedings. It is further submitted that there are serious allegations regarding demand of an amount of Rs.12,00,000/-. Learned APP submits that the transcript of the telephonic conversation prepared during investigation clearly reveals that the applicant extended threats of dire consequences to the complainant, who is a practising

Advocate, merely because he had performed his duties as a Court Commissioner appointed by the Court. It is therefore submitted that the offence is serious in nature and custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary. Hence, this is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

8. I have carefully gone through the investigation papers made available by the learned APP. The Call Detail Records (CDR) and Subscriber Detail Records (SDR) pertaining to the mobile phone of the applicant are sought from the concerned agency. The supplementary statement of the complainant has also been recorded. The transcript of the telephonic conversation between the applicant and the complainant is produced on record.

9. A perusal of the said transcript prima facie reveals that threats were extended by the applicant to the complainant and that there was a demand of Rs.12,00,000/- for settlement of the dispute. Upon perusal of the telephonic conversation, it appears that the applicant not only threatened the complainant with dire consequences but also attempted to pressurize him in respect of the partition proceedings. The allegations are serious in nature, particularly considering that the complainant was discharging duties as a Court Commissioner appointed by the Court.

10. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of allegations and the material collected during the course of investigation, this Court is not inclined to exercise discretion in favour of the applicant under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. In my opinion, the application is devoid of merit and substance and is therefore liable to be rejected.

**ORDER**

- i. The Anticipatory Bail Application is hereby **REJECTED**.

( MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J. )