

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

**ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1542 OF 2019**

Shashikant Mohan Gavhane

.... Applicant

versus

The State of Maharashtra

.... Respondent

- Mr. Satyavrat Joshi I/b. Nitesh J. Mohite, Advocate for the Applicant.
- Ms. S. S. Kaushik, APP for the State/Respondent.
- Mr. N. M. Sarangkar, PI, Shirur Police Station, Pune present.

**CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.**

**DATE : 16<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2019**

**P.C. :**

1. The applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in connection with C. R. No.385/2019 registered with Shirur Police Station, Pune under Section 326, 324, 323, 504, 141, 143, 142, 146, 147 r/w. 149 of IPC.

2. The FIR is lodged on 21/5/2019 by the injured Dilip Chougule himself. He has stated in his FIR that, on 21/5/2019, at about 3.00 p.m., he had attended the wedding ceremony at

Andhalgaon Phata. At that time, there was quarrel between his maternal uncle and paternal uncle. Thereafter, the first informant asked his paternal uncle as to why he abused and quarreled with other uncle. At that time, his uncle got angry and started quarreling and assaulting the first informant. At that time, present applicant who was standing nearby picked up wooden stick and assaulted the first informant on his head. Thereafter, other 3 to 4 accused assaulted first informant by fist and kick blows. Thereafter, first informant ran away from the scene and his friend took him to the Government hospital. On the basis of these allegations, the FIR was lodged.

3. Heard Mr. Satyavrat Joshi, Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Ms. Kaushik, Ld. APP for the State.

4. Mr. Joshi submitted that the applicant had no direct role in the main quarrel. He was present nearby but he had no intention to cause any grievous hurt to the injured.

5. Ld. APP has produced the investigation papers which contains a medical certificate showing head injury which is described as grievous injury. In this view of the matter, offence under Section 326 is made out. The role of the applicant is also pinpointed in the FIR. Therefore, no case is made out to grant anticipatory bail. Hence, the application is rejected.

**(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)**