

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1106 OF 2026**

Sanjay Bhalchandra Kulkarni

... Applicant

Versus.

The State Of Maharashtra And Anr.

... Respondents

Mr. Ashok B. Tajane a/w Y. A. Tajane, for the Applicant.

Ms. Anagha Deshmukh, APP for the Respondent – State.

Mr. Sharad Dhikate, Sarkar Wada Police Station, Nashik.

CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.

DATE : 6th MAY, 2026.

P.C. :

1. By the present Application under Section 482 of the BNSS, the Applicant seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No. 70 of 2026 registered with Sarakar Wada Police Station, Nashik (FIR), for offences punishable under Sections 118(1), 140(3), 353, 351(2), and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. There are three accused in the present crime. Applicant is Accused No. 2.

3. The prosecution case is that the informant was abused and

assaulted on his knee with an iron rod by the Applicant, Accused No. 1 and Accused No. 3 over a dispute regarding the return of money. The informant was thereafter taken in the car, where an attempt was made to strangle him with the seatbelt.

4. Mr. Ashok B. Tajane, learned Advocate for the Applicant, submits that the Informant has lodged a false FIR. He submits that the Informant is a friend of Accused No. 1. He submits that the Informant is a well-built Advocate by profession and that it is impossible to force or take the Informant into a car as alleged. He submits that the Applicant and Accused No. 1 have themselves paid an amount of Rs. 15,50,000/- to the Informant towards the legal fees for the work done, and therefore, there is no occasion to demand an amount of Rs. 44,000/- from the Informant. He submits that the Applicant is a senior citizen. He submits that Accused Nos. 1 and 3 have been released on Anticipatory Bail.

5. Ms. Anagha Deshmukh, learned APP for the Respondent-State, submits that the Informant has named the Applicant as the assailant. She submits that there are three CCTV cameras in the locality where the incident occurred. She submits that the

Investigation Officer has obtained CCTV footage capturing the incident. She submits that the CCTV panchnama records the Applicant assaulting the Informant. She submits that the CCTV footage and timing correspond to the statement made by the Informant. She submits that the Applicant is the main assailant. She submits that the incident took place in a public place, creating fear in the locality about the breakdown of law and order. She submits that the Applicant is absconding and is required for custodial interrogation.

6. Mr. Ashok Tajane, learned Advocate for the Applicant, in rejoinder to submissions of Ms. Anagha Deshmukh regarding the CCTV footage, states that there is a delay in conducting the panchnama of the CCTV footage, no identification parade was conducted by Respondent No. 1 and that there are discrepancies regarding the timing of the incident.

7. The allegations against the Applicant are serious. The Applicant is alleged to have assaulted the Informant, a practicing Advocate, using an iron rod. As submitted by Ms. Anagha Deshmukh, the incident is captured on CCTV footage with accurate

timing.

8. Considering the active role of the Applicant in the crime, no case for indulgence is made.

9. This Application is therefore dismissed.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)