



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.916 OF 2025

Sahadab Jabbar Sheikh Vs. State of Maharashtra

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Shri R.M. Daga, Advocate for applicant.
Ms H.N. Prabhu, AGP / APP for respondent/State.

CORAM : M.W. CHANDWANI, J.

DATE : 19.01.2026.

1. The applicant is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.332/2024 registered with Police Station, Hingna, Nagpur City, Nagpur for the offence punishable under Sections 108, 80, 85 read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. It is contended on behalf of the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant has not played any role. Rather, according to him, the allegations are against the family members of the applicant who have been protected by this Court. According to him, the applicant is required to be protected by this Court. He also submits that the investigation is completed, charge-sheet has already been filed and hence, no custodial interrogation of the applicant is required.

3. *Per contra*, learned APP submits that there are statements of relatives and neighbours who have stated about the harassment of the deceased at the hands of the

applicant and other co-accused. According to him, the applicant has not taken care of the deceased even after she consumed the poison. Therefore, she sought rejection of the application.

4. I have perused the case dairy. It appears that the deceased was the wife of the applicant. She married the applicant on 02.06.2022. The allegation is that after six months of marriage, the applicant alongwith other co-accused used to taunt her on account of demand of car as well as cash.

5. It appears that prior to the death of the deceased, the relatives of the applicant quarreled with her and therefore, she consumed the poisonous substance. She was taken to the hospital. The father of the deceased went to meet her in the hospital. Having found that no care has been taken by the applicant to make sure that the deceased is getting proper medical attention, he took the deceased with him. On 25.07.2024, the father of the deceased took her to Savaner Hospital and upon advise of the doctor, they rushed her to Nagpur and admitted her at Meditrina Hospital, Nagpur. However, on 28.07.2024 at about 11.00, it was informed that she passed away. Prior to that, when the deceased was taken to the hospital by the applicant and the co-accused, it appears that the doctor advised the applicant that the deceased requires to be admitted but the applicant did not listen and took her back from AIIMS Hospital, Nagpur to

treat her in the village.

6. There are specific allegations against the applicant that he was demanding money for purchasing a car. That apart, had he considered the advise of the doctor, the deceased would have survived. Thus, it can clearly be seen that the applicant acted against medical advice.

7. Considering the role assigned to the present applicant as well as the aspects mentioned above; in my view, no case is made out for granting anticipatory bail.

8. So far as the submission of the learned counsel for the applicant that other co-accused have been protected by this Court is concerned, let me state that a girl stays with the family of the groom solely on the faith that her husband will take care of her and also protect her from such type of harassment as is alleged in the present case. Rather, in this case the applicant has willingly joined the other co-accused to harass his own wife and therefore, the argument of the learned counsel for the applicant has no substance. Hence, the application is rejected.

(M.W. Chandwani, J.)

Wagh