

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF BAIL NO. 258 OF 2022

Suwarna w/o Babasaheb Ghuge

Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra & another

Respondents

Mr. S. C. Arora, Advocate for the applicant.
Mrs. G. L. Deshpande, APP for the State.
Mr. D. S. Kale, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

WITH
APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF BAIL NO. 254 OF 2022

Suwarna w/o Babasaheb Ghuge

Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra & another

Respondents

Mr. S. C. Arora, Advocate for the applicant.
Mrs. G. L. Deshpande, APP for the State.
Mr. P. M. Nagargoje, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

WITH
APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF BAIL NO. 255 OF 2022

Suwarna w/o Babasaheb Ghuge

Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra & another

Respondents

Mr. S. C. Arora, Advocate for the applicant.
Mrs. G. L. Deshpande, APP for the State.

WITH

APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF BAIL NO. 256 OF 2022

Suwarna w/o Babasaheb Ghuge

Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra & another

Respondents

Mr. S. C. Arora, Advocate for the applicant.

Mrs. G. L. Deshpande, APP for the State.

Mr. D. S. Kale, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

WITH

APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF BAIL NO. 257 OF 2022

Suwarna w/o Babasaheb Ghuge

Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra & another

Respondents

Mr. S. C. Arora, Advocate for the applicant.

Mrs. G. L. Deshpande, APP for the State.

Mr. P. M. Nagargoje, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

CORAM : R. M. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 5th JUNE, 2023.

PER COURT :

1. These applications are for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the accused in connection with Crime No. 427/2022 registered with Chikalthan Police Station, Aurangabad, for offence punishable under Section 306 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. After making substantial submissions across the bar, learned counsel for the applicant states that direction to the Trial Court to expeditiously decide the trial would be sufficient. Learned counsel for the respondents states that the case has not been committed yet to Sessions Court and hence it would be premature to pass any direction in this regard. He further informed that applications filed by the respondents for quashment of the charge-sheet are pending before this Court.

3. Without going into the merits of the case and only for the reason that the prime witness in this case is a lady who had unfortunately lost her husband, this Court finds it appropriate to direct the Sessions Court to decide the trial within a period of two years after committal of the case.

4. In view of above, applications stand disposed of.

(R. M. JOSHI)
Judge