

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 298 OF 2026**

Rahmani Aadil Mohammad Saeed

... Applicant

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra

... Respondent

Adv. Ramesh Dule Patil a/w Adv. Lisa Das i/b Jay and Co., for the Applicant.

Mrs. Rajeshree Newton, APP for the Respondent – State.

PSI – Shrikant Dangre, Azadnagar Police Station, (Nashik Rural).

CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.

DATE : 5th May, 2026.

P.C. :

1. Heard Mr. Ramesh Patil learned Advocate for the Applicant and Mrs. Rajeshree Newton learned Advocate for the Respondent-State.

2. By the present Application, the Applicant is seeking pre-arrest bail, apprehending arrest, in Crime No. 150 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 309(6), 351(2), and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. There are four accused in the crime. The Applicant is Accused No. 2.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the Applicant and the other Accused lured the Complainant by calling him to a particular place. A conspiracy was hatched to have a honey trap on the Complainant. Upon the Complainant reaching the spot where the girl (Accused No. 1) was present, the Accused started video shooting the Complainant in a compromising situation with the Accused No. 1, the plan being to blackmail the Complainant. Thereafter, the Complainant was manhandled, assaulted and an amount of Rs. 40,000/- was taken from him.

5. Mr. Ramesh Patil, learned Advocate for the Applicant, submits that the Applicant was merely a bystander who assisted in apprehending the Complainant while the Complainant was fleeing from the other accused. He further submits that the Applicant has no other role.

6. Ms. Rajeshree Newton, learned APP for the State, submits that the Applicant and the other accused were involved in a crime

to blackmail the Complainant. She submits that the Applicant, along with the two other accused and the girl (Accused No. 1), had planned a honey trap on the Complainant. She submits that the Applicant has the following criminal antecedents :-

Sr. No.	F.I.R. No.	Police Station	Court	Case No.
1.	190/22	Malegaon City	ACJM, Malegaon	RCC/794/22
2.	56/22	Azad Nagar	ACJM, Malegaon	RCC/631/22
3.	63/23	Azad Nagar	Sessions Court, Malegaon	Sessions Case/129/24
4.	90/24	Killa	ACJM, Malegaon	RCC/796/25
5.	57/23	Pawarwadi	JMFC, Malegaon	RCC/310/24
6.	177/23	Azad Nagar	Addl. Sessions, Malegaon	Cr. BA/726/2025
7.	4/22	Pavarvadi	Addl. District & Sessions, Malegaon	SC/96/22
8.	82/22	Killa	Civil Court Senior Division, Malegaon	RCC/775/24

7. The Hon'ble Supreme court in the case of Sharad Sehgal v/s State of U.P.¹, as held that antecedents alone are sufficient to deny discretionary relief of Anticipatory Bail.

8. Considering the allegations in the complaint, the gravity of

¹ 2026 SCC OnLine SC 740

the offence, and the Applicant having criminal antecedents, the Applicant is not entitled to any indulgence.

9. This Application is therefore dismissed.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)