

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

918 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.91 OF 2021

- 1) Vikram s/o Maroti Muknar,
Age 38 years, Occ. Agril.,
R/o. Wahad, Tq. Kandhar
Dist. Nanded.
- 2) Maroti s/o Gunwant Muknar,
Age 26 years, Occ. Agril.,
R/o. Wahad, Tq. Kandhar
Dist. Nanded.

Versus

- 1) The State of Maharashtra,
through, Police Station, Mukhed,
Tq. Mukhed Dist. Nanded.
- 2) The District Superintendent of Police,
Nanded, Dist. Nanded.

...
Advocate for Applicants : Mr. Vaibhav B. Dhage
APP for Respondents-State : Mrs. R.P Gaur

...
CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL, J.

DATE : 23 FEBRUARY 2021

PER COURT :

The applicants are seeking bail in the event of their arrest in connection with crime registered with Mukhed Police Station, Dist.Nanded being Crime No.0304/2020 for the offences punishable under Section 364-A, 324, 323, 504 and 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. The FIR has been lodged by one Dayanand Ashok Waghmare, alleging that on 05.09.2020, when he along with his father Ashok, injured Sheshrao and few others were proceeding on a motor-cycle, the applicants and the other accused intercepted them. They insisted that they should pay the money for being paid to the Sugar Factory. When the informant and his colleagues refused, applicant Maruti is stated to have assaulted informant with a pocket knife. Thereafter, the applicants and third accused assaulted and abused Sheshrao and Ramrao and thereafter, the applicant No.1 forcibly abducted Sheshrao by making him ride on his motor-cycle. After sometime, the informant received a phone call from applicant No.1, demanding ransom for releasing him. The FIR was lodged and the offence was registered.

3. I have heard the learned Advocate for the applicants and the learned APP for the respondent-State.

4. It is pertinent to note that a specific and precise role is attributed to both the applicants. The applicant No.1 is stated to have abducted Sheshrao on the farmer's motor-cycle, whereas, applicant No.2 is stated to have assaulted the informant with his pocket knife.

5. There is a statement of Sheshrao corroborating his version. The injury certificate of the informant also corroborates his allegations

against the applicant No.2. There is an injury caused by a sharp weapon.

6. Apart from such state of affairs, there are statements of the witnesses, who have seen the incident, corroborating the prosecution version.

7. Taking into account, the specific and precise role attributable to both the applicants, their custodial interrogation is highly necessary.

8. The Application is rejected.

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)

sarowar