



where the eyewitnesses are there, on irrelevant factors, the bail was granted and therefore, I do not find that the principles of parity would apply to the present case.

4. As far as the merit is concerned in the FIR a specific role is attributed to the applicant and it is evident that the applicant was holding sickle and he wielded blow on the deceased.

5. The learned counsel for the applicant, however, points out that after two days the informant change this version and attributed the main role to Saurabh Patil. He further points out that similarly the other witnesses also attributed the role to the co-accused, Saurabh Patil. However, the statement of other witnesses were recorded after more than 10 days.

6. In addition to this, there are 13 antecedents against the applicant and all the offences are bodily offences. Thus, there is every possibility that if the applicant is released on bail he may commit the similar offence. In that view of the matter and as there is sufficient incriminating material and evidence available against the applicant, I am not inclined to grant bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(ANIL S. KILOR, J)