

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.581 OF 2026

Rahul Shankarsingh Kushwah	... Applicant
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra	... Respondent

Mr. Ramesh Mishra for the Applicant.
Mr. Swapnil V. Walve, APP for the Respondent-State.
API J. S. Shaikh, Borivali PS is present.

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : 13TH MARCH 2026

PC. :

1. This is an Application for anticipatory bail.

2. The Applicant is apprehending his arrest in Crime No.117 of 2026 registered with Borivali Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 118(1), 351(2), 352, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that on the date of incident, which took place on 01st February 2026, the first informant came to meet one Dhirubhai at Railway Station, Borivali. It is alleged that the Applicant and co-accused Pavan, who were known to him, were already there at railway station. It is alleged that they accosted him and started quarreling with him on account of some monetary dispute. It is alleged that when the first informant refused to pay the amount demanded by them, they started assaulting him and thus the first informant with a view to save himself ran out of the railway station. It is alleged that the Applicant and other co-

accused followed him, caught hold of him, dragged him and forcibly made him to sit in autorickshaw. It is alleged that they then took him to isolated place and assaulted him there with a stick.

4. I have heard Learned Counsel for the Applicant and Learned APP for the Respondent-State.

5. Learned Counsel for the Applicant submits that with some ulterior motive, false allegations are made against the Applicant. It is submitted that there is a delay in lodging the FIR. It is further submitted that there is no need of custodial interrogation and the Applicant is ready and willing to cooperate in the investigation. The learned counsel for the Applicant submits that there are no criminal antecedents against the Applicant

6. On the other hand, Learned APP for the Respondent-State submits that the specific overt act of assault is attributed to the present Applicant. It is submitted that there is a CCTV footage which corroborates the version of the first informant. It is submitted that considering the nature of crime, the Applicant may not be released on anticipatory bail.

7. I have perused the FIR and viewed the CCTV footage. The CCTV footage corroborates the version of the first informant. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to release the Applicant on anticipatory bail. Hence, the present Anticipatory Bail Application is rejected.

(N.R. BORKAR, J.)