

Anand

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

BAIL APPLICATION NO.1806 OF 2016

Ravi alias Ravindra Vasant Bhise .Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra .Respondent

**WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.77 OF 2017
(For Intervention)
IN
BAIL APPLICATION NO.1806 OF 2016**

Mahavir Namdeo Londhe .Intervenor

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN

Ravi alias Ravindra Vasant Bhise .Applicant

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra .Respondent

Mr.Ashish Satpute, Advocate, for the Applicant
Mr.S.S.Hulke, APP, for the Respondent – State
Mr.Prashant Hagare, Advocate, for the Intervenor

CORAM : REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.

DATE : 25.04.2017

P.C.

. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. By this Application, the Applicant seeks his enlargement on bail in connection with C.R.No.97 of 2015

registered with the Indapur Police Station, Pune (Rural), for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 302, 307, 143, 147, 148 & 149 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Perused the papers.

4. The incident has taken place on 24.03.2015 at about 7.30 p.m.. Although, the Applicant has not been named in the FIR, in the Supplementary Statement, the Applicant has been named and role has been ascribed to him. Similarly, the statements of Rupesh Gupta Gaikwad and Somnath Madhukar Kharwade show that the Applicant was present at the spot; that he had come in a Rickshaw; was armed with a koyta; and had assaulted the deceased Dhananjay Gopal Washimbekar with the said koyta. The post mortem report shows that the deceased has sustained several injuries. There is recovery of sickle at the instance of the Applicant. The Applicant also has antecedents. Learned APP informs that the Applicant was convicted in one case, for the offence punishable under Section 324 of the Indian Penal Code in July, 2016 and that there is a similar case registered as against the Applicant for the offence punishable under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code, for attempting to

murder the very same deceased i. e. Dhananjay in 2005.

5. Considering the aforesaid, this is not a fit case to enlarge the Applicant on bail. Hence, the Application stands rejected.

6. In view of disposal of the Bail Application, the Intervention Application does not survive and the same stands disposed of accordingly.

7. It is made clear that the observations made herein are *prima facie*, and the trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits, in accordance with law, uninfluenced by the observations made in this order.

(REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.)