



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 317 OF 2026

NARESH SURESH TAYADE
VS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
---	---------------------------

Shri A.S.Dhage, Advocate for applicant.
Shri N.R.Rode, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM: RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.

DATED : 28th APRIL, 2026.

Apprehending arrest, the applicant/original accused no. 1 has preferred this application in connection with First Information Report No. 264/2023, dated 05/10/2023, registered with Police Station Tamgaon, District Buldhana for the offences punishable under Sections 353, 143, 147, 149, 504 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 135 of Maharashtra Police Act, 1951.

2. The informant is one Madhav Baburao Payghan who was working on the post of Block Development Officer with Panchayat Samiti Office at Sangrampur. In short, it is alleged in the FIR that, on the day of the incident i.e. on 03/10/2023, a mob consisting accused persons entered the chamber/office of the informant and questioned him. It was alleged in the FIR that the aforesaid accused persons were demanding that the inquiry be made on a complaint regarding illegal disbursement of grant. They had also sat on a hunger

strike. It is due to this reason, all the accused persons entered the chamber and abused and insulted the informant. So far as the present applicant is concerned, it is specifically stated that he has threatened the applicant. The incident narrated resulted in the registration of the FIR. The applicant was not arrested during the course of the investigation, and at the time of submission of the Final Report, a notice to appear before the jurisdictional Court was issued in his favour. In this background, the applicant has filed an application for grant of anticipatory bail.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant in the aforesaid background has submitted that, the charge-sheet is already filed and just because he did not appear before the jurisdictional court in pursuance with the notice issued by police, his anticipatory bail application was rejected by the Sessions Court. He submitted that, during the course of investigation, he had cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Per contra, the learned APP for the State has submitted that, since the applicant has not appeared before the jurisdictional Court, it shows tendency to disobey the direction. He thus prayed for the rejection of the application.

5. With the assistance of the respective learned counsels, I have gone through the record of the case. The FIR in question was registered on 05/10/2023 and Charge-Sheet was filed on 23/08/2025. During the course

of investigation, the applicant was not arrested by the investigating agency and the notice was issued to him calling upon to remain present before the Magistrate Court as the Final Report was to be filed. Thus, it is clear that, the custody of the applicant was not required by the investigating agency. Since the investigation is completed, in view of the aforesaid discussion, the following order is passed:-

ORDER

- i) The application is **allowed**.
- ii) In the event of arrest, in connection with First Information Report/Crime No. 264/2023, dated 05/10/2023, registered with Police Station Tamgaon, District Buldhana for the offences punishable under Sections 353, 143, 147, 149, 504 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 135 of Maharashtra Police Act, 1951, the applicant 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 not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence the witnesses.
- iv) The applicant shall not leave the India without prior permission of the Court.
- v) Accordingly, the Application stands **disposed of**.

(RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.)