

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 639 OF 2024

Sangram Babu Ranpise

...Applicant

Versus

State Of Maharashtra

...Respondent

....

Mr. Ramnik Pawar a/w Ms. Samiksha Pawar, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. Shailesh Chavan a/w Mr. Amarsinh Katkar, Advocate for Original Complainant.

Ms. Kirti Hivrale, APP for Respondent-State.

....

CORAM : PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.

DATE : 6th MARCH, 2024.

P.C.:

1. This is a third application for bail before this Court. The first application was rejected vide Order dated 23rd December, 2022. Subsequently, the second application was rejected by this Court on 1st February, 2024. However, the trial was expedited. It was also directed that in the event, the trial is not concluded within one year the Applicant is at liberty to file fresh application for bail.

2. The Applicant is arrested on 6th April, 2021 in connection with C.R. No.286 of 2021 registered with Satara City Police Station

for offences under Sections 302, 201 r/w 34 of Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned Advocate for the Applicant submitted that the pursuant to rejection of the Application for bail by this Court, the co-accused Vikrant *alias* Manya Umesh Kamble who is the main Accused has been granted bail by the coordinate bench vide Order dated 6th February, 2024. While granting bail to the co-accused this Court had considered the merits of case. Thus, there is change in circumstance. The Applicant is in custody for substantial period of time. The Applicant is entitled for bail on the ground of parity. Reliance is placed on the Order passed by Supreme Court in the case of *Tarun Chaudhary V/s. State of U.P (Special Leave to Appeal No.3459 of 2023)*, Order passed by the Supreme Court in the case of *Mohammad Faisal @ Faisal S/o Jjamad Mohiddin V/s. State of Karnataka Electronic City Police, Bangalore, 2015 0 Supreme(Kar) 1369* and the *Order dated 7th January, 2023 passed by this Court in Criminal Application (BA) No.1374 of 2022.*

4. Learned APP submitted that two applications for bail preferred by Applicant were rejected by this Court. There is no change in circumstance. The second application was rejected recently on the ground that there is no change in circumstance and

role of the Applicant.

5. Learned Advocate for the complainant submitted that there is not change in circumstance to entertain this application. The previous application was rejected on 1st February, 2024. The Order dated 6th February, 2024 granting bail to the co-accused by the coordinate bench has been challenged by the complainant before the Supreme Court by preferring Special Leave to Appeal No.8672 of 2024 and the Apex Court vide Order dated 5th March, 2024 has issued notice, returnable in six weeks.

6. It is pertinent to note that first application for bail was rejected on merits by passing detailed Order. Thereafter, the second application was rejected recently on 1st February, 2024. However, the trial was expedited. On 6th February, 2024 i.e. within a week after rejection of the second application for bail preferred by the Applicant, the co-accused has been granted bail by the coordinate bench. The said Order has been challenged before the Apex Court. It is relevant to note that while rejecting the previous applications this Court has considered the evidence against the Applicant. I do not find any reason to take a different view of the matter to grant bail to the Applicant.

ORDER

. Criminal Bail Application No.639 of 2024 stands rejected;

(PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.)