

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
BAIL APPLICATION NO.3715 OF 2025**

Rajendra Bhima ChavanApplicant
Vs.
The State of MaharashtraRespondents

Mr. Saurabh P. Tandale, for the Applicant.
Mr. Chandrakant D. Mali, APP, for the Respondent-State.
Mr. A. B. Chavan, PSI, Ichalkaranji Police Station is present.

**CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.
DATED : 25th FEBRUARY 2026**

PC.:-

1. The Applicant is arrested in Crime Registration No.127 of 2025 registered with Ichalkaranji Police Station, District Kolhapur for the offences punishable under Sections 309(4), 126(2) read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('BNS').

2 The prosecution case is that on the complaint the crime is registered against this Applicant that he has snatched the chain of a informant, who was passing through the road by dropping her daughter to the Coaching Class. She was going on her two wheeler vehicle bearing No.MH-09-FW-3805 and two persons came on the motorcycle, blocked the informant's vehicle on road and asked the address of one Sakharam Patil. At that time, person sitting behind

the rider of said motorcycle suddenly put his hand in her neck and snatched her *mani mangalsutra* weighing approximately 20 gm and 210 milligram. The chain broke into two parts, one part falling on the road and the other part taken away by the person, who snatched it. Out of the persons who forcibly and intentionally stole the informant's *mani mangalsutra*, was about 35 years old. The crime is registered against this Applicant.

3. The counsel for Applicant has stated that the Applicant is falsely implicated in this case as there are 22 antecedents of chain snatching. The counsel for Applicant has stated that four incidents are registered against this Applicant within a period of one hour, which is not possible and he is falsely implicated in this crime. Hence, prayed to release the Applicant on bail.

4. The learned APP opposed the application stating that CCTV footage shows that the Applicant is riding on the motorcycle and he has snatched the chain. There are 22 antecedents, which are not mentioned by the Applicant. The learned APP has stated that the notice for test identification parade is issued. As the Applicant is habitual offender of same offence, prayed to reject the application.

5. Heard learned counsel appearing for both the parties.
6. The Applicant has suppressed the fact that he is having 22 antecedents of similar offence. He has not mentioned it in the application, which is mandatory. The CCTV footage shows that he is the person, who was riding the motorcycle. Only because the test identification parade is not conducted, the Applicant is not entitled for bail. As there are 22 antecedents and those are suppressed by the Applicant, the Application is rejected.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)

Digitally
signed by
RAJU
DATTATRAYA
GAIKWAD
Date:
2026.02.27
16:27:34
+0530