



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL(S) NO(S) . OF 2026
(Arising out of SLP (Crl.) No(s).21370 OF 2025)

ASHISH SATISH MITTAL

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

CRIMINAL APPEAL(S) NO(S) . OF 2026
(Arising out of SLP (Crl.) No(s).41 OF 2026)

CRIMINAL APPEAL(S) NO(S) . OF 2026
(Arising out of SLP (Crl.) No(s).1270 OF 2026)

O R D E R

Leave granted.

2. These appeals challenge the common judgment and order dated 16.12.2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay in Bail Application Nos. 2850 of 2025, 2470 of 2025 and 3751 of 2024.

3. The appellants have 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 (in short, "MV Act"). The applications seeking regular bail having been rejected by the High Court vide impugned order dated 16.12.2025, the appellants have preferred the instant appeals.

4. This Court, vide its orders dated 07.01.2026 and 22.01.2026, issued notice(s) in the instant matters.

5. Heard learned senior counsel for the appellants in support of the appeals; learned standing counsel for the respondent(s)-State; and learned senior counsel appearing for the impleading applicant(s), who have all vehemently argued their respective cases.

6. We have perused the material on record.

7. Learned senior counsel appearing for the appellants submitted that insofar as the appellants in SLP(Crl.) No(s).21370 of 2025 and 41 of 2026 are concerned, no

allegation or offence has been alleged against their wards. In fact, the appellant in SLP (Cr1.) No(s).21370 of 2025 is a friend of the father of the child who was in the back seat of the car and the appellant in SLP (Cr1.) No(s).41 of 2026 is the father of the child who was in the backseat of the car, the driver of which is said to have caused the accident owing to rash and negligent driving resulting in death of two innocent persons on 19.05.2024. The appellant in SLP (Cr1.) No(s).41 of 2026 is stated to be a "middleman" who had received a sum of Rs.3 lakhs for the purpose of replacing the samples of the blood of the wards of the two juveniles. He is said to have handed over a sum of Rs.3 lakhs to the Assistant of Dr. Srihari Halnor. It was submitted since there has been no allegation whatsoever as against the two juveniles who are in the backseat of the car, it is unlikely that there would have been any kind of attempts made by these appellants for replacing the blood samples of the said two juveniles, who are in the backseat of the car. However, since the allegations were made as against these appellants, they were arrested and are in jail for various periods upto nearly eighteen months. It was submitted that even as against the driver who had caused the accident,

the punishment is only upto three years even if it is held that it was the juvenile who caused the accident. The alleged perpetrator is now being proceeded before the Juvenile Justice Board. In the circumstances, it was contended that continued incarceration of these appellants, in the absence of there being any progress in the trial and possibility of there being a delay in the conclusion of the trial since there are as many as nearly 100 prosecution witnesses to be examined would cause grave prejudice to these appellants.

8. In the circumstances, it was contended that the impugned orders may be set aside and the relief of bail may be granted to the appellants herein subject to the terms and conditions to be imposed by the court.

9. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent(s)-State with reference to the counter affidavit contended that any release of these appellants would inevitably frustrate the trial itself inasmuch the allegations as against these appellants are not just under Section 201 but also under Sections 467 read with section 34 of the IPC as well as the provisions of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and hence, no leniency may be shown

by this Court with regard to these appellants.

10. Learned senior counsel for the impleaded respondent(s) also supported the learned counsel for the State and contended that the conspiracy between these appellants, the parents of the perpetrator, and the alleged juvenile driver, who caused the accident subsequent to the accident, is clearly evident and if at this stage they are permitted to be released, then the trial itself would be jeopardized. He therefore submitted that there is no merit in these appeals and the same may be dismissed.

11. Considering the facts on record and the aforesaid submissions, in our view, the case for bail is made out.

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

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

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

14. The appellants shall not misuse their liberty in any manner.

15. The appellants shall not make any attempt to contact the witnesses either directly or indirectly.

16. Any infraction of the conditions shall entail cancellation of bail granted to the appellants.

With these observations, the appeals are allowed.

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

....., J.
(UJJAL BHUYAN)

NEW DELHI;
FEBRUARY 2, 2026

ITEM NO.69

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
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

PETITION(S) FOR SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL (CRL.)
NO(S) .21370/2025

[ARISING OUT OF IMPUGNED FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER DATED 16-12-2025 IN BA NO. 2850/2025 PASSED BY THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY]

ASHISH SATISH MITTAL

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

RESPONDENT(S)

IA NO. 338613/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA NO. 338614/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

WITH

SLP(CRL) NO. 41/2026 (II-A)

IA NO. 1520/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA NO. 1521/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA NO. 1519/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES

SLP(CRL) NO. 1270/2026 (II-A)

Date : 02-02-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

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

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Dave, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Anand Dilip Landge, AOR
Mr. Aditya Dewan, Adv.
Mr. Dhvani Shah, Adv.
Mr. Manas Syal, Adv.
Mr. Shwetank Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Shradha Ladda, Adv.
Mr. Ashish Mittal, Adv.
Mrs. Sangeeta Nenwani, Adv.

Ms. Revati Pravin Kharde, Adv.
Mr. Shreenivas Patil, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Prakash Pathak, Adv.

Ms. Sana Raees Khan, Adv.
Mr. Pranay Shridhar Chitale, AOR
Mr. Aditya Dutta, Adv.

Mr. Siddharth Agarwal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Prashant Patil, Adv.
Mr. Abid Mulani, Adv.
Mr. Shakti Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Ashish Agarkar, Adv.
Mr. Raj Mulani, Adv.
Ms. Harshada Parbhane, Adv.
Mr. Karan Dalla, Adv.
Ms. Divya Anand, AOR

For Respondent(s) : 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.
Mr. Aditya Krishna, Adv.
Ms. Chitransha Singh Sikarwar, Adv.

Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Agrawal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Vishal Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Manan Verma, AOR
Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Pranjal Tandon, Adv.
Ms. Mansi Diwakar, Adv.

Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Agrawal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Vishal Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Manan Verma, AOR
Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Pranjal Tandon, Adv.
Ms. Mansi Diwakar, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Leave granted.

Appeals are 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)
BABBAR)
COURT MASTER (SH)
(NSH)

(DIVYA
COURT MASTER