



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

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1305 OF 2024

PRAMOD RAMESH DHURVE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...
Advocate for Applicant : Ms. Sabahat T. Kazi
APP for Respondent : Ms. V. S. Choudhari
...

CORAM : S. G. MEHARE, J.

DATE : 09-08-2024

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned A.P.P. for the State.
2. The applicant seeks bail in C.R.No.25 of 2022 registered with Kundalwadi Police Station, Taluka Biloli, District Nanded, for the offence punishable under Sections 302 and 201 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. The learned counsel for the applicant has vehemently argued that there is no evidence against the applicant. The police arrested him on suspicion. The offence is registered belatedly. There was no scope of finding blood on their clothes. The false evidence of finding blood on clothes has been created against the applicant merely because residing in the State of Madhya Pradesh. No incriminating evidence has been collected against him. The material investigation has been completed. Hence, he may be

granted bail.

4. The learned A.P.P. for the State has strongly opposed the application. She has vehemently argued that the accused took the two lives for trifling ground of not paying the money. The applicant and the deceased were residing together. After the incident, the applicant suddenly disappeared. The vehicles belonging to the deceased were seized from the applicant and co-accused from far away distance from the spot of the incident. The dead body was also recovered at the instance of accused/applicant. It was a cold blooded murder. The applicant hails from the State of Madhya Pradesh. Hence, he may not be granted bail.

5. Perused the papers.

6. The prosecution has a strong evidence of last seen together and the post incident conduct. Two dead bodies have been recovered at the instance of the applicant. The property like tractor, tracing machine and motorcycle have also been recovered from the applicant and co-accused. The applicant, the co-accused and the deceased were neighbours. They have no reason to take away the tractor and crushing machine from the custody of the deceased. The offence is apparently serious. The presence of the applicant lastly seen with the deceased and the post incident conduct of the applicant are the strong circumstances against them. The offence is grave and serious. Hence, the applicant

does not deserve bail.

7. For the above reasons, the application stands rejected.

8. The above observations are restricted to bail application only.

(S. G. MEHARE)
JUDGE

rrd