

(1)

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

**CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 2365 OF 2016**

Sandip s/o Sopanrao Bhise

..APPLICANT

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & ors.

..RESPONDENTS

Mr N. B. Narwade, Advocate for applicant;  
Mr S. J. Salgare, Addl. Public Prosecutor for respondent No. 1;  
Mr H. D. Deshmukh, Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 & 3

**CORAM : N.W. SAMBRE, J.**

**DATE : 5th July, 2016**

**ORAL ORDER :**

Heard.

2. The bail granted to the respondent Nos. 2 and 3 – accused, by the learned Ad hoc District Judge-3 & Additional Sessions Judge, Ahmednagar, below Exh. No. 1, in Criminal Misc. Application No. 400 of 2016, for offences punishable under Section 307, 326, 325, 143, 147, 148, 149, 323, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 4/25 of the Arms Act, is questioned in the present application on merits, as according to the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant, the offence, in which the respondents-accused are involved, is punishable with imprisonment for more than ten years and serious one.

(2)

3. He would then submit that the order of grant of bail lacks reasons and in view of the attack with iron rod by the respondents-accused, the complainant has suffered grievous injuries i.e. fractures to left leg and both the hands.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor supported the case of the complainant.

5. Perused the entire papers. There is unexplained delay of about four days in lodging first information report. The age of the respondent Nos. 2 and 3 - accused is about 67 and 65 years respectively. The court below as such, has exercised the discretion in favour of the respondents – accused. The respondents have not violated the conditions, on which they were released by the learned Court below.

6. In the above background, no case for cancellation of bail is made out. Criminal Application fails and stands rejected.

**(N.W. SAMBRE, J.)**

sjk