

## FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
APPELLATE SIDE, BENCH AT AURANGABAD

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1079 OF 2015****[Sanjay s/o Vasant Mane Vs The State of Maharashtra & ors.]**

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri N.R.Thorat, advocate for applicant  
Smt. S.G.Chincholkar, A.P.P. for respondent

.....

**CORAM : V.M.DESHPANDE, J.****DATED : 3<sup>rd</sup> AUGUST, 2015****PER COURT :-**

1] This is an application for cancellation of bail under Section 439 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

2] Heard Shri N.R.Thorat, learned counsel for applicant. Applicant is the first informant. By the present application, the applicant is challenging the grant of anticipatory bail by the learned trial court in Criminal Applications No.1385 of 2013, No.1230 of 2013, No.1343 of 2013 and No.1312 of 2013, passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Ahmednagar in Crime No. 225 of 2013 on 10.10.2013 for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307 324, 323, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Code and the relevant provisions of the Arms Act.

3] At the out set, learned counsel Shri Thorat submitted that he does not wish to challenge orders passed by learned trial court granting anticipatory bail in the Application Nos. 1230 of 2013 and Application No. 1385 of 2013. Statement accepted. In that behalf, application to that extent is dismissed as withdrawn.

4] After that, the present application is survived only against respondent nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7.

5] According to the first information report, applicant Sanjay lodged the report in respect of the incident, dated 19.10.2013. According to the first information report, when he and his brother Bharat were proceedings towards the house, three scorpio jeeps came there and 10 to 12 persons alighted from the said jeeps including the present respondents.

6] There are no specific allegations against respondent nos.4-Rohidas, 5-Pintu, 6-Bharat and 7-Satish. The allegations against respondent nos. 5 to 7 are most general in nature that they pelted stones.

7] In view of nature of accusation against them no fault can be attributed for granting anticipatory bail in their favour. Hence, application is rejected.

**(V.M.DESHPANDE, J.)**

dbm/crap1079.15