

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

BAIL APPLICATION NO.347 OF 2023

**SHUBHAM @ SUBHASH DIGAMBAR SONGAONKAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA**

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. A. D. Hande
APP for Respondent: Mr. S. P. Sonpawale

CORAM : S. G. MEHARE, J.

DATE : 15.03.2023

PER COURT :

1. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned A.P.P. for respondent/state.
2. The applicant has been arraigned in the crime registered for the offence of murder. The prosecution has also a case that the applicant was captured in the C.C.T.V. footage. The clothes worn by the applicant on the date of the incident were seized.
3. The learned counsel for the applicant would argue that the applicant was not identified by face in the C.C.T.V. footage. The clothes allegedly worn by the applicant as seen in the C.C.T.V. footage and the clothes seized are different. The prosecution has no strong evidence

against the applicant. He is a boy of 19 years old having no antecedents to his discredit. The allegations levelled against him are false. None of the eyewitnesses supported the prosecution. Hence, he deserves bail.

4. Per contra, the learned A.P.P. would argue that there were previous quarrels. The applicant has been captured in the CCTV footage. The blood stained clothes have been recovered from him. The offence is serious. The applicant/accused were aggressive. Hence, he does not deserve bail.

5. The submissions of the learned A.P.P. are supported with the documents. The incident has been captured in the C.C.T.V footage. The blood stained clothes were recovered at his instance. Considering the nature of offence and the way in which it was committed, the offence is apparently serious.

6. For the above reasons, the applicant does not deserve bail. Hence, the application stands dismissed.

(S. G. MEHARE)
JUDGE