



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1636 OF 2024

1. Hanuman Baburao Kachawe
2. Arjun Babanrao Ekilwale

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Another  
\*\*\*

- Mr. M. P. Tripathi, Advocate for the Applicants
  - Mr. S. V. Hange, APP for the Respondent/State
- \*\*\*

CORAM : R.M. JOSHI, J  
DATE : DECEMBER 11, 2024

PER COURT :

1. Applicants apprehend arrest in connection with with C.R. No. 345/2024 registered with Manwat Police Station, Dist. Parbhani for the offences punishable under Section 306 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Informant is wife of deceased Ram. It is her contention that her husband and present Applicants had acquaintance with each other. There were some dispute between them prior to occurrence of the incident. It is claimed by her that present Applicants had threatened the husband of the Informant that they would not allow him to work in Manwat City and, therefore, her husband was under mental pressure. On 01.05.2024 he went along

with Applicant No. 1 for work, however, did not return. On the next day, dead body of the husband of the Informant was found in the well.

3. Learned Counsel for the Applicants submits that there is delay of about three months in lodging of the report. It is his further submission that even if contention of the Informant is accepted as alleged in the report, the same cannot become a reason for commission of suicide.

4. Learned APP opposed the application by citing seriousness of the crime.

5. There is no dispute about the fact that the Applicants and deceased have well acquaintance with each other. Prior to 15 days of the incident, some dispute had occurred between them. Even if it is accepted that there was some threat given by the Applicants to the deceased, the same was not so serious that it will lead deceased to commit suicide. Perusal of the police papers indicates that injuries were ante mortem injuries found on the dead body. The deceased died due to drowning.

6. Having regard to the aforestated facts, more particularly, in view of the fact that there is delay in lodging of the report, this is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. In any case, Applicants have no criminal history behind them. This is not a case wherein any recovery is to be done at the instance of Applicants. In the result, application is allowed by confirming interim order dated 30.09.2024.

(R.M. JOSHI, J.)