

Nalawade

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1660 OF 2017

Mr. Bhaskar D.Shingade	..Applicant.
vs.	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondents.

Mr. Satyarat Joshi for the Applicant.
Mr.Ajay Patil , APP. for the State.

CORAM: A.S.GADKARI, J.
DATE : 8th September, 2017.

P.C.

1. This is an application under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. for bail in CR No.283 of 2015 dated 31.8.2015 registered with Kavate Mahakal Police, Station, District Sangli under Sections-302, 324,504, 143, 147, 148, 149, 341 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 135 of the Maharashtra Police Act.

2. It is the prosecution case that due to the dispute over the way to the agriculture field, on 30.1.2015 at about 5.00 p.m. a fight took place between the family members of the applicant and the first informant namely Ramchandra Shingade. In the said fight accused No.1 Rahul and the present applicant-Bhaskar inflicted blows with knife which they were carrying on deceased Rajkumar Shingade and Sandipan Shingade respectively. The said two persons succumbed to

the injuries. During the course of investigation the applicant came to be arrested on 1.9.2016 After completion of investigation the police have submitted charge sheet.

3. A perusal of charge sheet, would indicate that, apart from the first informant who has categorically attributed the role of inflicting knife blows on the deceased Sandipan Shingade, there are other more than five eye witnesses to the said incident. After commission of offence the applicant handed over the knife used in the present crime to accused No.1. Rahul Sargar and both the knives have been recovered at the instance of accused No.1 Rahul Sargar. Prima facie, it appears that the statements of eye witnesses are trust worthy and reliable and have been duly corroborated by other evidence on record. In the present crime applicant and other accused persons have committed the murder of two persons namely Rajkumar Shingade and Sandipan Shingade.

4. After taking into consideration the material available against the applicant and the gravity of the offence, this Court is of the view that the applicant does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. Application is accordingly rejected.

(A.S.GADKARI, J.)