



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

924 APPLICATION FOR CANCELLATION OF BAIL NO. 67 OF 2023

Mukta W/o. Balasaheb Darandale
VERSUS
The State of Maharashtra and Another

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Rajendra P. Phatke
APP for Respondent No.1: Mr. P.K. Lakhotiya
Advocate for Respondent No.2 : Mr. Y.L. Bidve h/f Mr. Sambhaji
Tawar

.....

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.
DATED : 14th AUGUST, 2024.

PER COURT :-

1. By this application, the applicant is praying for cancellation of bail granted to the respondent No.2.

2. It is the contention learned counsel for the applicant that the respondent 2 had tried to forcibly administer the poison to the informant. The offences under Sections 307, 498-A, 323, 504, 506 r.w. 34 of I.P.C. was registered against the respondent No.2. The respondent No.2 had filed an application for anticipatory bail and the learned Additional Sessions Judge has allowed the said bail application without giving custody of the respondent No.2. The custodial interrogation of the respondent No.2 is necessary, as considering the serious nature of the offence, the custody of the

respondent No.2 is necessary. But this fact is not considered by the learned Additional Sessions Judge. Hence, requested to allow the application.

3. It is the contention of learned counsel for respondent No.2 that in this matter the investigation is completed, charge sheet has been filed and the matter is committed to the Sessions Court. Hence, requested to reject the application.

4. The learned A.P.P. submitted that appropriate order be passed.

5. I have heard all learned counsel. Though the applicant is seeking cancellation of bail granted to respondent No.2, it appears from record that the investigation is completed and charge sheet has been filed against the respondent No.2. The matter is committed to the Sessions Court. Considering this fact, I pass the following order:-

O R D E R

The application is rejected.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)