



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1548 OF 2024

RANADHANRAJSINGH DEEPAKSINGH THAKUR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Ms. Poonam V. Bodke Patil, Advocate for the applicant
Ms. V. S. Choudhari, APP for the respondent/State

CORAM : S. G. MEHARE, J.

DATE : 18th SEPTEMBER, 2024

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the respondent/State.
2. The applicant is seeking for bail third time before this Court. The trial is in progress and a few witnesses have been examined.
3. The learned counsel for the applicant is referring to the finding recorded by the learned trial Court while rejecting the bail application as if she is arguing appeal or revision. Directly or indirectly she wanted to point out that the witnesses did do not support the prosecution. Hence, the applicant deserves bail.
4. When she was trying to take the Court to the

reasoning of the learned Addl. Sessions Judge while rejecting the bail application, the Court pointed out to her that when any matter is sub-judice and the trial is going on, the High Court can't express any opinion about the admissibility and inadmissibility of the evidence of the witnesses lead before the trial Court because it would amount interference with the trial and such findings if any may affect in judgment and order of the trial. The Court reminded her that for subsequent bail application there should be a substantial change in circumstance. However, she was not able to point out the substantial change in the circumstances and stuck up to what she was arguing before this Court. The law is settled that turning the witnesses hostile does not end the matter. The circumstances are to be assessed from the entire evidence and that is to be done by the trial Court at the end of the trial. The Court is not satisfied with the arguments of the learned counsel for the applicant.

5. For the reasons mentioned above, the application stands dismissed.

(S. G. MEHARE, J.)

ssp