



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION APL NO.1393/2025

Akash @ Tinu Suraj Gawli

..VS..

The State of Mah., thr.PSO PS Hinganghat, District Wardha

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

Court's or Judge's Order

Shri M.N.Ali, Counsel for the Applicant.

Shri A.M.Kadukar, APP for the State.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.

DATE : 14/01/2026

1. The present application is preferred by the applicant challenging order dated 2.9.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, (Court No.2), Hinganghat cancelling anticipatory bail granted to the applicant.

2. The applicant was apprehending his arrest at the hands of the police in connection with Crime No.1010/2025 registered under Sections 65(e) and 77(a) of the Maharashtra Prohibition Act with the non-applicant police station.

3. It is alleged in the FIR that the investigating agency has received a secret information, when they were on patrolling duty, that the applicant is in possession of illicit

liquor and, therefore, a raid was conducted and the liquor was seized from “Tin-Shed” of “Niranjan Welding Workshop” and the offence was registered against the applicant. Considering the apprehension of arrest, the trial court has considered prayer of the applicant for anticipatory bail, in the event of his arrest. The trial court has also considered that mere criminal antecedents are not sufficient and released him on anticipatory bail. However, he was directed to attend the concerned police station between 11:00 am and 2:00 pm on 8.8.2025. As the applicant has not attended the police station, as directed by the trial court, his bail was cancelled.

Hence this application.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that a only condition imposed upon the applicant was that the applicant shall attend the police station and due to some reasons, he failed to attend the concerned police station and, therefore, the trial court has cancelled the bail, which is erroneous and, therefore, the order passed by the trial court cancelling the bail deserves to be quashed and set aside.

5. Learned APP for the State submitted that it is not that the condition was imposed to attend the police station once a week or till filing of the chargesheet, but only on one date he was directed to attend the concerned police station, which is also not obeyed by the applicant. Despite criminal antecedents are there, the applicant was released on bail, but the applicant has no respect to the order passed by the trial court and he has disobeyed the said order and, therefore, the bail granted to him is cancelled. There is no illegality committed by the trial court and, therefore, the application deserves to be rejected.

6. On hearing both the sides and perusing the order cancelling the bail as well as the bail order passed by the trial court, it reveals that despite of criminal antecedents are there, prayer of the anticipatory bail is granted and only condition imposed was that the applicant shall attend the concerned police station between 11:00 am and 2:00 pm on 8.8.2025. Thus, only once the applicant was directed to attend the police station, which is also not obeyed by him. It reveals that though there are criminal antecedents against

the applicant, he was released on anticipatory bail on condition that only once he shall attend the concerned police station, but the applicant has shown complete disrespect to the order passed by the trial court and such type of applicants cannot be protected by this court, who has no respect to the courts' order.

7. In this view of the matter, the application deserves to be rejected. Accordingly, the application is **rejected**.

Application stands **disposed of**.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)

!! BrWankhede !!