

ISM

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 122 OF 2019**

Jaywantrao Namdevrao Jagtap	Applicant
V/s.	
The State of Maharashtra	Respondent

**WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 128 OF 2019
IN
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 122 OF 2019**

Digvijay Digambar Bagal	Intervener
-------------------------	----------------

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN

Jaywantrao Namdevrao Jagtap	Applicant
V/s.	
The State of Maharashtra	Respondent

Mr. A. Y. Sakhare Senior counsel i/b Mr. Harshvardhan Borse
advocate for the applicant
Smt. Rutuja Ambekar APP for the State
Mr. Kuldeep Patil for the intervener

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.

DATE : FEBRUARY 4, 2019.

P.C.

In Crime No. 777/2018 registered with Karmala Police Station,
Dist. Solapur for offence punishable under Sections 307, 324, 504,

506, 143, 145, 147, 149, 135 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, applicant is seeking pre-arrest bail.

2 The applicant and his son Vaibhav alongwith other co-accused are named in the aforesaid crime. This Court on 01/11/2018 granted protection in favour of Vaibhav, son of present applicant from whom revolver came to be seized on 07/10/2018. In the aforesaid background, Shri. Sakhare, the learned senior counsel for the applicant would urge that custodial interrogation of the applicant is not warranted, particularly when the offence is arising out of political enmity as could be borne out of contents of F.I.R. The learned senior counsel then would urge that other co-accused are already released on bail and as such, the custody of the applicant is not warranted.

3 The learned APP submits that there are no subsequent developments after order dated 01/11/2018 and sought rejection.

4 If the contents of F.I.R. are co-related with that of injury

certificate, the victim has suffered grievous injury.

5 Even though, the revolver was recovered from Vaibhav, son of applicant on 07/10/2010, it is subsequent thereto, the application of present applicant was rejected.

6 In the aforesaid background, I hardly notice any subsequent development or justifiable reason on the record which warrants interference in favour of the applicant. Application, as such fails, stands rejected.

7 Intervention application also stands disposed of.

[NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.]