

TIKAM

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 483 OF 2026

**VAISHALI
ANIL
TIKAM**

Amar Muniraj Panchapatre

...Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

...Respondents

Digitally signed
by VAISHALI
ANIL TIKAM
Date:
2026.04.09
15:40:49 +0530

Mr. Ali Kaashif Khan Deshmukh a/w. Ms. Snigdha Khandelwal a/w. Ms. Sandhya Sonawane a/w. Mr. Farid, Advocate for Applicant.

Ms. Gauri Rao, APP for Respondent-State.

Ms. Shambhavi Desai, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.

DATE : 7th APRIL, 2026.

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for Applicant, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for Respondent No.2.

2. By this application, the Applicant is seeking regular bail in Crime No. 0113 of 2025 registered with Chakan Police Station, Pune for the offences under Sections 64, 64(2)(m), 74, 75(1), 75(2) of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 read with Sections 4,6,8 and 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act,2012 (POCSO).

3. It is prosecution's case that Applicant sexually assaulted the victim on two occasions. The Applicant and victim were found on the railway station to the member of Railway Child Helpline Case Worker.

TIKAM

Accordingly, victim was inquired by the member of committee and complaint was lodged.

4. It is contention of learned counsel for the Applicant that there was love affair between applicant and victim. There is delay in lodging the complaint. Victim did not lodge the complaint herself, but, it was lodged after inquiring by the committee member. Applicant has no antecedents. At the time of incident, he was 22 years old. Applicant is behind bars around one year and requested to allow the application.

5. It is contention of learned APP along with learned counsel for Respondent No.2 that at the time of incident, victim was 13 years old. Applicant was aware of her age. He sexually assaulted her twice. The statement of the victim recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. supports the prosecution case. If applicant is released on bail he may abscond or threaten the victim or prosecution witnesses and requested to reject the application.

6. I have heard all the learned counsel. Perused charge-sheet and documents produced on record.

7. There is delay in lodging the complaint. At the time of incident, applicant was 22 years old. In the statement under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. the victim has stated that she had love affair with the Applicant. She lodged the complaint when committee members inquired with her.

TIKAM

Applicant has no antecedents. Applicant is behind bars around one year. It may take time to conclude the trial.

8. Considering these facts, I pass following order:

ORDER

- (i) The Applicant- **Amar Muniraj Panchapatre** be released on bail in Crime No. 0113 of 2025 registered with Chakan Police Station, Pune, on furnishing PR bond of Rs.25,000/- with one or two solvent sureties in the like amount.
- (ii) The Applicant shall not tamper with the evidence and/or influence the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The Trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits and in accordance with law, uninfluenced by the observations made in this order.
- (iv) The Applicant shall attend the concerned police station, as and when required.
- (v) Bail Application is allowed in the aforesaid terms.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)