



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

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 202 OF 2026

(Mohd. Dilshad s/o Haneef Siddiqui vs. State, thr PSO, PS Pardi, Dist. Nagpur and anr)

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

Court's or Judge's orders.

Ms. Rohini M. Khapekar, Advocate for applicants.
Mr. C.A. Lokhande, APP for non-applicant 1 /State.

CORAM: RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.

DATE: 16.04.2026

Heard.

2. Apprehending arrest, the original accused no. 3, in FCR No. 05025/125602, registered with Police Station, Pardi, Nagpur for the offences punishable under Sections 2(3),2(4)(a),2(6), 41,42,52,66,69 and 77 of the Indian Forest Act, 1927 read with Rules 31,53,58,59 and 82 of the Maharashtra Forest Rules, 2014, has approached this Court for anticipatory bail.

3. In short, it is alleged in FCR by complainant Mr. Prakash Bhadange, Range Forest Officer, Seminary Hills, Nagpur that the accused No.1 Mohd. Shakir was running a Saw Mill on which a raid was conducted whereon teak wood was found. It was alleged that the applicant/original accused no. 3 had entered into an agreement with original accused no. 1 for supply and cutting of teak wood. It is on these allegations, aforesaid offences were registered.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant has contended that his name was surfaced in the investigation when accused no. 1 disclosed that it was the present applicant who had entered into an agreement for supply and cutting of teak wood. She further contended that the original accused Mohd. Shakir was arrested and released on bail. So far as accused no. 2 is concerned, he was also released on bail. She further contended that all the offences are punishable with maximum imprisonment of one year. Per contra, learned PP contended that huge stock of teak wood was found in the Saw Mill of the original accused no. 1 and therefore, custody of present applicant is required.

5. With the able assistance of learned counsels for respective parties, I have gone through the case record.

6. This Court vide order dated 17.3.2026 has granted anticipatory bail to the applicant with direction to attend the concerned Police Station. It is not the case of the prosecution that applicant has not attended the Police Station. So far as the allegations regarding cutting and supplying of the teak wood is concerned, suffice it to say that it is on the basis of the statement of the accused, the prosecution has arrived at the conclusion of involvement of applicant in the crime. The crime property is already seized from the Saw Mill of the original accused no.1, who is released on bail. Since the applicant has no criminal antecedents as contended by the learned counsel for the applicant and as she has already cooperated the Investigating Agency, I am inclined to pass the following order:

ORDER

i) In the event of arrest, in connection with FCR No. 05025/125602, registered with Police Station, Pardi, Nagpur for the offence punishable under Sections 2(3),2(4)(a),2(6), 41,42,52,66,69 and 77 of the Indian Forest Act, 1927 read with Rules 31,53,58,59 and 82 of the Maharashtra Forest Rules, 2014, the applicant shall be released on bail on furnishing a P.R. bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with one solvent surety in the like amount.

iii) The applicant shall attend the concerned Police Station on 20th, 21st and 22nd of April 2026, between 2.00 pm to 3.00 pm.

iv) The applicant shall cooperate with the investigating agency and shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence the witnesses.

v) The applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court.

(RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.)