



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION(ABA) NO. 128 OF 2026

(Suraj s/o Rambhavan Pande Vs. State, thr PSO, PS Gadchandur, Tq. Korpana Dist.
Chandrapur)

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

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. Nikhil Sarve, Adv h/f Mr. Jasprit Singh Chilotra, Advocate
for applicant.
Mr. C.A. Lokhande, APP for Non-applicant /State.

CORAM : M.W. CHANDWANI, J.

DATE : 16.03.2026.

The applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in connection with Crime No. 19/2026, registered with Police Station Gadchandur, District Chandrapur, for the offences punishable under Sections 121(1), 132 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP for the non-applicant/State. Perused the case diary.

3. Perusal of the case diary reveals that on receipt of secret information, the police officials along with panchas reached at the spot near a railway track on Gadchandur to Patan road where they intercepted a vehicle wherein, animals were being transported in a cruel manner. Accordingly, the police officials started preparation of the panchanama. At that time, the applicant came there on a motorcycle and started arguing with the police officials and also attempted to stop them from performing their official duty of seizing the vehicle. The applicant caught hold of the collar of one of the police officials

i.e. the complainant and assaulted him on his chest by means of fists blows and also manhandled him. When the officials came to rescue the complainant, the applicant who happens to be a Corporator, assaulted those officials and prevented them from performing their official duty.

4. The injury report reveals that the complainant Mr. Balvant Sharma received three contusion injuries on his body. The Crime Chart shows 19 offences pending and 3 prohibitory actions against the applicant. The applicant was recently elected as a Corporator. Such act of cruelty against public servants, who were performing their official duty, is not expected from a public representative.

5. Considering the audacity of the applicant, coupled with his position as a public representative as well as his criminal antecedents; in my view, the applicant does not deserve the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail.

6. So far as the reliance placed on ***Satender Kumar Antil V. Central Bureau of Investigation, (2022) 10 SCC 51***, is concerned, it speaks about issuance of notice to an accused person after recording the reasons if the police wants his presence. No doubt, in the present case, notice has not been issued. However, it is submitted by the learned APP that the accused is absconding. That apart, it is for the Investigating Officer to decide whether the arrest is required or not. In this case, the applicant has suo motu approached the Court for anticipatory bail. Considering the aspects mentioned above, no case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail. Hence, the application is rejected.

JUDGE

Belkhede PS