



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO(S). _____ OF 2026
(@ SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRL.) NO(S).2932 OF 2026)

VISHAL SURENDRAKUMAR AGARWAL

APPELLANT

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

RESPONDENT

O R D E R

Leave granted.

This appeal challenges the order dated 16.12.2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay in Bail Application No.2733 of 2025.

The appellant has been facing trial in connection with a crime registered pursuant to FIR No.306 of 2024 dated 19.05.2024 lodged with Police Station Yerwada, District Pune City in respect of offences punishable under Sections 304, 279, 337, 338, 427, 120-B, 201, 213, 214, 466, 467, 468, 471, 109 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (in short, "IPC") and Sections 7, 7-A, 8, 12, 13 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (in short, "PC Act") and Sections 184, 185, 199/177, 3(1)/180, 5(1)/181 and 199(a) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (in short, "MV Act"). The application seeking bail having been rejected by the High Court *vide* impugned

order dated 16.12.2025, the appellant has preferred the instant appeal.

Vide order dated 26.02.2026, this Court issued notice in the instant matter.

Heard learned counsel for the appellant in support of the appeal and learned standing counsel for the respondent-State.

Learned senior counsel appearing for the appellant submitted that the appellant herein is the father of the minor boy who was driving the car on the fateful day despite a driver being provided; that the allegations which have been levelled as against the appellant herein are not true at all; that with regard to the other accused this Court has granted the relief of bail; the appellant herein is also similarly situated inasmuch as he has also completed twenty two months of incarceration. In the circumstances, the appellant herein also may be granted the relief of bail subject to the terms and conditions to be imposed.

In this regard, the order passed by this Court in the connected appeals viz., CrI.A.No.627, 628 and 629 of 2026 dated 02.02.2026; CrI.A.No.973 of 2026 dated 18.02.2026; and CrI.A.No.1177 of 2026 dated 27.02.2026 have been brought to our notice.

Per contra, learned standing counsel for the respondent-State with reference to the counter affidavit contended that the allegations against the appellant herein are serious; that there is no parity between the appellant-accused and the accused in the other cases wherein this Court had granted the relief of bail inasmuch as the appellant herein is the father of the child, who drove the vehicle on the fateful day leading to the death of two innocent persons on the road. He contended that attempts were made by the appellant and the other accused to ensure that evidence in the instant case is not only suppressed, but also was wholly substituted inasmuch as the attempts were made to substitute the blood samples of the appellant's son and his friends who were sitting in the backseat of the car. The allegations being serious as against the appellant herein, this Court may not grant the relief as sought for by the appellant as it would jeopardize and frustrate the investigation as well as the trial.

In the circumstances, learned standing counsel for the respondent contended that there is no merit in this appeal and the same may be dismissed.

We have considered the arguments advanced at

the bar in light of the material on record as well as the fact that in similar cases, this Court had already granted the relief of bail to the other co-accused viz., CrI.A.No.627, 628 and 629 of 2026 dated 02.02.2026; CrI.A.NO.973 of 2026 dated 18.02.2026; and CrI.A.No.1177 of 2026 dated 27.02.2026. We also note that the appellant herein has been in jail for the last twenty two months. In the circumstances, we find that the appellant has made out a case for bail.

We, therefore, allow this appeal and direct as under:

“The appellant shall be produced before the concerned Trial Court as early as possible and the Trial Court shall release him on bail, subject to such conditions as it may deem appropriate to impose to ensure his presence in the proceedings arising out of FIR No.306 of 2024 mentioned above.”

It is directed that the appellant shall extend complete cooperation in the trial of the instant case.

The appellant shall not misuse his liberty in any manner.

The appellant shall not make any attempt to

contact the witnesses either directly or indirectly.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of this case, we direct that the appellant shall in no way cause any frustration or delay in the trial.

We also direct the concerned Trial Court to endeavour to conclude the proceedings at the earliest.

Any infraction of the conditions may entail cancellation of bail granted to the appellant.

With these observations, the appeal is allowed.

....., J
(B.V. NAGARATHNA)

....., J
(UJJAL BHUYAN)

NEW DELHI
MARCH 10, 2026

ITEM NO.4

COURT NO.4

SECTION II-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

PETITION(S) FOR SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL (CRL.) NO(S).
2932/2026

[ARISING OUT OF IMPUGNED FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER DATED 16-12-2025 IN BA NO. 2733/2025 PASSED BY THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY]

VISHAL SURENDRAKUMAR AGARWAL

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

RESPONDENT(S)

IA NO. 52433/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA NO. 52434/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA NO. 52435/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 10-03-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE B.V. NAGARATHNA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE UJJAL BHUYAN

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Agarwal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Dave, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Prashant Patil, Adv.
Mr. Shakti Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Pranav Patil, Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Arora, Adv.
Mr. Gagandeep Singh, Adv.
Mr. Dhruv Wadhwa, Adv.
Mr. Ujjwal Malhotra, Adv.
Mr. Karan Dhalla, Adv.
Ms. Ranjeeta Rohatgi, Adv.
Mr. Sagar Pahune Patil, AOR
Ms. Devanshi Papat, Adv.
Mr. Lzafeer Ahmad, Adv.
Mr. Sabir Kachhi, Adv.
Mr. Himanshu Tyagi, Adv.
Ms. Shasya Singh, Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Kumar Singh, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Manan Verma, AOR
Mr. Vishal Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Pranjal Tandon, Adv.
Ms. Mansi Diwakar, Adv.

Mr. Tushar Mehta, Solicitor General
Mr. Siddharth Dharmadhikari, Adv.
Mr. Aaditya Aniruddha Pande, AOR
Mr. Shrirang B. Varma, Adv.
Mr. Bharat Bagla, Adv.
Mr. Sourav Singh, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Krishna, Adv.
Mr. Adarsh Dubey, Adv.
Ms. Chitransha Singh Sikarwar, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Leave granted.

Appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order,
which is placed on file.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand
disposed of.

(B. LAKSHMI MANIKYA VALLI)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(DIVYA BABBAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)