

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.849 OF 2019

Swapnil Vilas Bahadurkar] ... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra] ... Respondent

WITH

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.850 OF 2019

Ganesh Madhukar Lonkar] ... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra] ... Respondent

Mr. Rupesh Zade, Advocate for the Applicants in both ABA's.
Mr. Prashant Jadhav, APP for State/Respondent.

CORAM :- SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.
DATE :- 31st JULY, 2019.

P. C. :-

1. These matters are placed on board today. However, the order passed on 09/04/2019 indicates that, the final order in these applications is already passed. The tenor of that order shows that, the Learned Judge of this court (Coram : P.N. Deshmukh J.) had allowed

these applications. The exact observations in last three lines of paragraph two are as follows :

“In that view of the matter, applications are liable to be allowed on merits as well as on parity with other co-accused”

2. However, the following sentence mentions “accordingly following 'interim' order is passed” (emphasis supplied). After that sentence the operative part appears. The word interim order has created some confusion. The clause in the operative part of the order also indicates that, these applications were finally decided. Even there the last clause i.e. clause (v) mentions, Stand over to 07/06/2019 and therefore the matter is again placed on board from time to time. Reading the order in its entirety including operative part of the order it is clear that, these applications are finally decided vide order dated 09/04/2019. Therefore, no further directions can be issued. The applications are accordingly disposed of.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)