

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2953 OF 2024**

Gotya @ Akshay Navnath Jadhav	...	Applicant
vs.		
The State of Maharashtra	...	Respondent

Mr. Abhay Arjun Jadhavar for applicant.

Mr. Bapu V. Holambe-Patil, APP for respondent-State.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE, J.
DATE : 14th NOVEMBER, 2024**

P.C. :

. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the respondent-State.

2. By this application, the applicant has approached this Court for the reason that he apprehends arrest in connection with FIR No.0276 of 2024 dated 26.04.2024, registered at Karmala Police Station, District Solapur Rural for offences under Sections 143, 144, 147, 148, 149, 307, 323, 324, 326, 341, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) and Section 135 of the Maharashtra Police Act, 1951.

3. It is to be noted that in the present case, the applicant moved two successive anticipatory bail applications before the Sessions Court. The first application was rejected by a reasoned order dated 11.06.2024, after the Sessions Court took into consideration the nature of allegations made against the applicant with regard to the incident in question. Thereafter, the applicant filed the second anticipatory bail application on 14.08.2024 before the Sessions Court on the ground that the investigation was completed,

chargesheet was filed and also that the co-accused was released on regular bail.

4. By order dated 06.09.2024, the Sessions Court took note of these facts and after referring to the order of the Supreme Court in the case of *G. R. Ananda Babu vs. The State of Tamil Nadu and another* (order dated 28.01.2021 passed in Criminal Appeal arising out of SLP (Crl.) No.213 of 2021), rejected the second anticipatory bail application also.

5. The applicant has now approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail.

6. This Court is of the opinion that the Sessions Court was justified in rejecting the second successive anticipatory bail application by relying upon the aforementioned order of the Supreme Court, wherein it has been specifically held that successive anticipatory bail applications ought not to be entertained, when the accused is absconding and not co-operating with the investigation.

7. Apart from the aforesaid position, this Court has also perused the FIR. The presence and role of the applicant is stated and it is to be noted that this case involves offence under Section 307 of the IPC, apart from other offences registered against the applicant and other accused persons.

8. No case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail.

9. The application is dismissed.

(MANISH PITALE, J)