PRACHI PRANESH NANDIWADEKAR
Digitally signed by PRACHI PRANESH NANDIWADEKAR
Date: 2026.10.12 18:59:09 +0530

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2213 OF 2026

Sanjay Krishnaprasad Singh … Applicant
V/s.
The State of Maharashtra & Anr. ... Respondents

Mr. Murtaza Najmi a/w Mr. Shambhu Jha, Ms. Farida Najmi, Ms. Nancy Kanugo, Mr. Afsar Ansari, Mr. Suraj Pandey, Ms. Areefa Siddiquie and Nasrah Ansari, for the Applicant.

Ms. M. R. Tidke, APP, for the Respondent No.1-State.

Ms. Pravada Raut (appointed through Legal Aid), for Respondent No.2.

Mr. Shrikishan H. Kande, PSI attached to Hinjewadi Police Station, present.

CORAM : MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.

DATED : 12 OCTOBER 2026

P. C. :-

1. Heard Mr. Najmi, learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant and Ms.Tidke, learned APP appearing for the Respondent No.1-State.

2. By this application filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the Applicant is seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with C.R. No.155 of 2026 registered with Hinjewadi Police Station, Pimpri Chinchwad, Pune for the offences punishable under Sections 74 and 75 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 8 and 11 of the Protection of

Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO Act).

3. It is the submission of the learned counsel appearing for the Applicant that the Applicant is also conducting tuition classes and therefore, there is a rivalry between two teachers conducting classes i.e. tuition teacher of the victim and the Applicant. To substantiate the said contention, learned counsel appearing for the Applicant has relied on contentions raised in paragraph nos. (F), (G) and (H) of the Anticipatory Bail Application. He points out the contradiction in the statements of the teacher, child and mother and submits that false F.I.R has been filed.

4. On the other hand, Ms. Tidke, learned APP and Ms. Pravada Raut, learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.2 appointed to represent Respondent No.2 submitted that offence is very serious concerning sexual assault on a child of 10 years.

5. At the outset, it is necessary to set out the prosecution case which is set out in paragraph no.3 of the Anticipatory Bail Application which reads as under :-

> **"3. The Story of the prosecution in nutshell is that :-**
>
> a) It is alleged that on 13.03.2026 at about 6:15 p.m., while the victim was returning home from her tuition class and had reached near the staircase leading to the parking area adjacent to Building B-6, the Applicant intercepted her, caught hold of her hand and allegedly enquired about

her residence, tuition classes and asked her whether she had a boyfriend.

b) It is further alleged that the Applicant offered her chocolates and gifts, asked whether she would love him, and requested her to kiss him. According to the prosecution, when the victim shouted that she did not want any gift, the Applicant asked her not to disclose the incident to anyone and fled from the spot.

c) The victim thereafter informed her tuition teacher, who informed the First Informant. The First Informant and her husband allegedly verified the CCTV footage of the society premises and, upon making enquiries, identified the Applicant as a tenant residing in Flat No. 212, Building B-2 of the same society.

d) On the basis of the said allegations C.R. No. 155 of 2026 came to be registered at Hinjewadi Police Station, Pimpari-Chinchwad, for the offences punishable under Section 74 & 75 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 8 & 11 of the POCSO Act, 2012.

e) The Allegations are more precisely described in First Information report dated 14.03.2026."

6. Perusal of the record shows that as per the prosecution case, the Applicant by offering chocolates and gifts sexually assaulted the victim. The Applicant has asked indecent questions to a girl child of 10 years like whether she is having a boyfriend and also tried to kiss the victim. Thus the offence is very serious concerning a child of 10 years. During the investigation, it is also transpired that on earlier two occasions, the Applicant has taken videos of the victim. Thus there is no substance in the contention raised that the

Applicant is only helping the victim.

7. The Applicant is B.Tech. and MBA Graduate and was working with Byjus. He has come up with this case that he was engaged in an educational related start-up providing student's counselling and guidance. In the said society, he was staying as a tenant. It is not his case that he was conducting tuition classes in the said society. No material is produced to show that he was conducting tuition classes. The contention raised is an after thought to support the contention that there is rivalry between two tuition teachers. Thus, there is also no substance in the contention that the F.I.R. has been filed as a result of rivalry between two tuition teachers.

8. Although the contention is raised regarding some contradiction in the statement of teacher, child and mother, perusal of the same clearly shows that there are no contractions.

9. Thus, no case is made out for grant of Anticipatory Bail.

10. Anticipatory Bail Application is dismissed.

11. It is clarified that the observations made in this order are only prima facie observations made for the purpose of deciding the Anticipatory Bail Application.

12. This Court places on record the appreciation of the assistance rendered by Ms. Pravada Raut, learned counsel appointed to represent the interest of Respondent No.2. The High Court Legal Services Authority is requested to pay her professional charges as per the Rules.

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]