

vks

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO.1496 OF 2016**

|                          |                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Amar Anil Salvi          | .... Applicant. |
| V/s.                     |                 |
| The State of Maharashtra | .... Respondent |

Mr. Ajit Savagave, for the Applicant.  
Mr. Arfan Sait, APP for the Respondent State.  
Mr. Gajanan Kadale, Pimpri Police Station, Pune.

**CORAM : A. M. BADAR, J.**

**DATE : 2<sup>nd</sup> AUGUST, 2016.**

**P.C. :**

1. The applicant/accused, in Crime No.38 of 2016, registered with Pimpri Police Station, Pune, for the offences punishable under Sections 436 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, by this application, is praying for releasing him on bail.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the applicant/accused. He argued that Ravi Vishwanath Waghmare is a got up witness and he had not seen anything. By drawing my attention to statement of Dayanand Gavas, a police constable, the learned counsel argued that this he has not disclosed the name of person who had informed him about the incident. The learned counsel further argued that

the CCTV footage does not show presence of the applicant at the scene of the offence.

4. The learned APP opposed the application by contending that the offence is serious.

5. Perusal of chargesheet, according to prosecution case, the present applicant and his friend/co-accused Soheli had been to the hotel and bar of the informant. After consuming liquor and having dinner both of them refused to pay the bill and quarrelled with the owner. They left by threatening the informant. According to prosecution case, immediately after three hours, the present applicant and co-accused Soheli set that hotel and bar ablaze. The CCTV footage was seized from which presence of the present applicant and the co-accused is reflected. During the investigation, statements of witnesses came to be recorded and there is witness, who has vouched about the presence of the present applicant alongwith co-accused Soheli, at the time of setting hotel and bar ablaze.

Considering the nature of crime alleged against the present applicant, he is not entitled for bail. However, as very few witnesses are cited and much time will not be required for concluding the trial, the trial can be expedited. Hence the following order.

#### Order

1. The Application is rejected.

2. The learned Sessions Judge is requested to hear and decide the Sessions Case arising out of above crime and dispose of the same within the period of six months from the date of receipt of writ of this Court.

**[A. M. BADAR, J.]**