



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 575 OF 2026

VIJAY MOTIRAM RATHOD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Pralhad C. Bhagure
APP for Respondent-State : Mr. K. K. Naik

CORAM : MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.
Date : 20th April, 2026

ORDER :-

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. 70 of 2026 dated 16.03.2026, registered with Pimpalner Police Station, District Beed, for the offences punishable under Sections 74, 352 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
3. The informant lodged a report alleging that the present applicant (accused), while under the influence of alcohol, forcibly caught hold of her hand and dragged her with ill-intention. During the course of this, the applicant reportedly issued threats of dire

consequences to the informant, warning her against disclosing the incident to any third party. The informant raised an alarm, prompting the applicant to flee the scene. Upon the return of the informant's mother at approximately 6:00 pm, the informant immediately disclosed the details of the assault and intimidation. Consequently, the FIR came to be registered.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated and deliberately roped into the present crime. It is submitted that the informant and the applicant have been in a long-standing consensual relationship. The present FIR is a retaliatory measure stemming from a financial dispute; specifically, the informant had demanded an amount of Rs. 10,000/- from the applicant, and upon his inability to fulfill said demand, the present FIR came to be registered. The applicant maintains a clean record with no prior criminal antecedents. The applicant is willing to abide by any stringent conditions this Court may deem fit to impose. In light of these circumstances, it is prayed that the application be allowed and the applicant be granted relief.

5. The learned APP strongly opposes the present

application, submitting that the applicant is involved in a serious offence that directly outrages the modesty of the informant. Considering the gravity of the accusations, the prosecution expresses a well-founded apprehension that if the applicant is enlarged on bail, there is every likelihood of him tampering with the prosecution evidence or exerting undue pressure and threats upon the informant. The custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary to unearth the facts of the case. Hence, it is prayed that the application be rejected.

6. I have gone through the investigation papers made available for perusal. Upon a thorough review of the record, it appears that the investigation is almost complete. Consequently, the necessity for the custodial interrogation of the applicant is not prima facie established at this juncture.

7. Upon an examination of the material on record, there appears to be evidence indicating a prior consensual relationship between the informant and the applicant. The submission of the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present crime following his refusal to pay a sum of Rs. 10,000/—does not appear to be improbable at this stage.

However, these observations are prima facie in nature and are made only for the purpose of deciding the application, as such, the same may not influence the Trial Court.

8. Taking into consideration the nature of the allegations, the applicant's lack of criminal antecedents and the advanced stage of the investigation, I find no impediment in granting the prayer for anticipatory bail. The rights of the investigating agency can be sufficiently protected by imposing stringent conditions upon the applicant to ensure his cooperation with the ongoing probe. As such, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the present applicant. Hence, the following order is passed :-

ORDER

- i. The Anticipatory Bail Application is allowed.
- ii. In the event of arrest of the Applicant – Vijay Motiram Rathod, he be released on bail on furnishing P.R. bond of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) with one or two solvent sureties in the like amount each, in connection with FIR bearing Crime No. 70 of 2026 dated 16.03.2026, registered with Pimpalner Police Station, District Beed, for the offences punishable under Sections 74, 352 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 on the following conditions :-
 - A) The Applicant is directed to attend the concerned police station and report to the Investigating Officer

on 27.04.2026, 28.04.2026, 04.05.2026, 05.05.2026, 11.05.2026 and 12.05.2026 and thereafter, as and when, called by the Investigating Officer, for the purpose of investigation.

- B) The Applicant shall also cooperate with the investigation.
- C) The Applicant shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses and shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence, in any manner.
- D) The applicant shall furnish copies of his Aadhaar Card and PAN Card to the Investigating Officer along with the addresses and mobile numbers of two nearest relatives.
- E) The applicant shall not enter into the entire vicinity of village Antharwan Pimpri Tanda, Tq. Dist. Beed till filing of the charge-sheet.

1. Needless to say, violation of any of the aforesaid conditions may entitle the prosecution to seek cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted hereinabove.
2. The observations made herein are prima facie and shall not influence the Trial Court while deciding the case on its own merits.
3. In view of the above, the Anticipatory Bail Application stands disposed of.

(MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.)

Omkar Joshi