



drp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.240 OF 2024

Ummedsingh Suratsingh Deshmukh

APPLICANT

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Another

RESPONDENTS

.....

Mr. Joydeep Chatterji, Advocate for the applicant

Mr. A. R. Kale, APP for respondent - State

Mrs. Monica R. Dahat, Advocate for informant

.....

[CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]

DATE : 3rd MAY, 2024

ORDER :

1. Applicant apprehends arrest in connection with Crime No. 357 of 2023 registered with Dondaicha Police Station, District - Dhule for offence punishable under sections 307, 392, 323, 504, 506, 427 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. FIR is lodged by Rushikesh alleging that, his father had given Rs.5,00,000/- to accused as hand loan. Accused returned Rs.2,50,000/-, however, avoided to repay the remaining Rs.2,50,000/-. On 18th November, 2023, while accused was at Malpur Chaufuli, informant and his father went there at about 6.15 p.m. They demanded back the remaining amount of Rs.2,50,000/-. Thereupon, accused started abusing informant's father. He attempted to kill his father by throttling him. When the informant intervened, accused assault him also and snatched

gold chain from his neck. Accused threatened the informant that he will eliminate his entire family.

3. Heard learned advocate for applicant, learned APP for the State and learned Advocate for informant. Perused investigation papers.

4. Informant has filed an affidavit on record, stating that the articles, which were snatched during the incident, are received back and the matter is settled due to intervention of common friends and the applicant has cleared off all the dues and they have received all that they have lost in the incident, including gold chain and no dispute or dues remained and everything is amicably settled.

5. Applicant further submits that proceeding for quashing of the FIR, on the basis of compromise, is moved before the learned Division Bench and the said matter is kept on 16th June, 2024.

6. Considering the developments in the matter, no useful purpose would be served by remanding applicant to custody.

7. Hence, the application is allowed by confirming interim protection.

[NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI]
JUDGE