



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

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.356/2026**

Sukhdeo Ramlal Chavan

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra thr. P.S.O., P.S. Mangrulpir Dist. Washim and another

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

Court's or Judge's orders

-----  
Shri S.A. Chaudhari, Advocate for applicant  
Shri A.M. Ghogre, APP for non-applicant No.1-State  
Shri R. Siddharth, Advocate (appointed) for non-applicant No.2

**CORAM : PRAVIN S. PATIL, J.**

**DATE : 09.06.2026**

1. Heard.

2. By this application, the applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in Crime No. 317/2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 74 and 75 of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 and Section 8 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

3. In brief, the case of the prosecution is that the informant who is mother of the victim has lodged police complaint on 15.04.2026 stating therein that her husband is expired one year before and she is presently residing at village Chandhai with her son and daughter aged about 9 years old. It is specifically stated in the complaint that the victim has told the present informant about the molestation at the hands of applicant. She has given the details as to

how the present applicant has latched the door of the room and misbehave with the victim.

4. On the basis of this complaint, the offence is registered in the matter. The applicant came with a submission before this Court that to avoid the payment of outstanding amount, false case is lodged against him. According to the applicant, he is running a grocery shop at village Chandhai and time and again the deceased husband of the informant has taken away the grocery on credit from his shop, as such, total Rs.30,000/- was outstanding against the husband of the informant. However, due to his demise, the present applicant has insisted the informant to pay that amount. As a result, the present informant by taking in hands her daughter has lodged false complaint against him, therefore, the applicant prays for anticipatory bail.

5. The applicant further stated that he is 57 years old person and having a good reputation in village. He also pointed out that the wife of the present applicant lodged a police complaint on 15.04.2026 against the present informant alleging that the present informant has lodged false complaint against her husband.

6. Learned APP has strongly opposed the present application. He has produced the case diary and pointed out certain statements which are recorded by the investigating officer in the matter including statement of the victim.

7. After going through the record, it is revealed that

victim has no reason to make allegation against the applicant in the matter. At this stage, it cannot be concluded that complaint lodged by informant is false. Only after full fledged enquiry, conclusion can be drawn in the matter.

8. In the present matter, considering the nature of allegations and the age of victim, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail in the matter. In my opinion, in such offences, which are against the society, interference at this stage by this Court is not warranted.

9. In view of above, I find no merit in the application, hence, the application stands rejected.

10. The fees of the appointed Counsel be quantified as per the Rules.

**(PRAVIN S. PATIL J.)**

R.S. Sahare