

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

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1399 OF 2026

Hanuman Vaman More	 Applicant
Vs.	
State of Maharashtra	 Respondent

Mr. Rahul S. Arote with Tanvi Mahadik with Nikita Gawai with Jay Suryawanshi for the Applicant.

Ms. Rashmi Tendulkar, APP for the Respondent-State.

Mr. Vijay Sahebrao Dakhore, PSI, Kalyan Taluka police station.

CORAM : SHYAM C. CHANDAK, J.

**DATED : 3rd JUNE, 2026
(VACATION COURT)**

P.C. :-

. Applicant is apprehending his arrest in C. R. No.251 of 2026 under Sections 310, 115(2), 189(2), 191(3), 333, 79, 118(1) of the the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita registered with Kalyan Taluka police station on the report dated 12th March, 2026 filed by Dinesh Kashivale.

2) Heard Mr.Arote, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Ms.Tendulkar, learned APP for the Respondent-State.

3) The prosecution case is that on 11th March 2026, at about 00.30 hours pm, at village *Chinchvali*, a quarrel occurred during *Haldi* ceremony on account of which the accused persons, namely, Tushar, Chetan, Sunil and Akshay assaulted the son of the informant. At about 00.45 hours, the

Applicant and seven others went to house of the informant. Four of them, caught hold of the hair of informant's wife and his two daughters, pulled them out of the house and gave fist and kick blows. Accused Tushar More snatched the marriage string from the person of the informant's wife. Accused Sunil More and co-accused Akshay More snatched the chain from the person of the informant's daughters. They also abused the three women. Therefore, the informant intervened. However, accused Sunil More assaulted him by means of an iron rod and caused him minor injury. Accused Tushar snatched the chain and accused Akshay snatched two rings from the person of informant. Villagers namely Vijay Kashivale and Mahesh Kashivale came to intervene and stop the quarrel. However, the Applicant, accused Tushar, Chetan, Sunil and Akshay assaulted the two by means of sharp iron object over head, back and hands and caused them injuries. Therefore, the aforesaid crime came to be registered. The Anticipatory Bail Application filed by the Applicant came to be rejected by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kalyan.

4) Mr. Arote, the learned Counsel for the Applicant submitted that the incident has occurred all of sudden. The allegation that the Applicant was armed with a sharp iron object is vague, contradictory and false. The Applicant has not caused any serious injury to any of the injured persons. All the weapons allegedly used in the offence have been recovered. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the Applicant is not needed. He further submitted that the Applicant is a public servant and therefore, he has been

falsely involved in the FIR. Therefore, the Applicant is entitled for bail.

5) Ms. Tendulkar, learned APP strongly opposed the Application. She has submitted that the Applicant was present at the spot during the occurrence. The Applicant and the co-accused have assaulted the victims with dangerous weapons. Injured Vijay has sustained a grievous injury. As such, the offence is serious. The custodial interrogation of the Applicant is essential to recover the weapon he has used in the offence. Therefore, bail may be refused.

6) I have considered these submissions. It is alleged in the FIR that witness Vijay Kashivale and Mahesh Kashivale were attacked by the Applicant and other co-accused by means of sharp iron object. However, the learned APP submitted that, according to witness Vijay Kashivale, the Applicant was having an iron rod which is contradictory to the FIR. There is no specific allegation against the Applicant that he had used either of the said weapon against a specific victim and caused him some injury. As such, custodial interrogation of the Applicant does not appear necessary. The main allegations are against the co-accused. After filing of the FIR, the iron rod and knife are recovered by the I.O. The co-accused Chetan and Karan have been released on bail. Mr. Arote submitted that the Applicant is a public servant working with Indian Railways. The Applicant has no criminal antecedents. He is not likely to tamper with the prosecution evidence and abscond.

7) In the wake of above, the Applicant is entitled to be released on bail

on certain terms. Hence, the following Order :-

- (a) The Application is allowed.
 - (b) In the event of arrest of the Applicant-Hanuman Vaman More in connection with FIR No.251 of 2026 registered with Kalyan Taluka police station under Sections 310, 115(2), 189(2), 191(3), 333, 79, 118(1) of the the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, he shall be forthwith released on bail, on his furnishing P.R. Bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one or two sureties in the like amount.
 - (c) The Applicant shall attend before Investigating Officer at Kalyan Taluka police station from 5th to 7th June 2026 between 11.00 am to 4 pm and thereafter as and when required.
 - (d) The Applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence and shall not threaten the prosecution witnesses.
 - (e) The Applicant shall attend each and every date before the trial Court, unless exempted by such Court, and cooperate for expeditious disposal of the said case.
 - (f) The Applicant shall not commit any offence.
 - (g) If the Applicant disobeys any of the above conditions, the anticipatory bail granted herein shall stand cancelled without further reference to this Court or the trial Court.
- 8) Application stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(SHYAM C. CHANDAK, J.)