



the role that he was standing at the spot of incident there is no role attributed to the applicant. It is submitted that the applicant is in jail from last 9 months and in the meantime the charge-sheet has been filed. It is therefore, submitted that further custody of the applicant is not necessary. Accordingly, he prays for grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned APP strongly opposed the application and points out the relevant evidence which is against the applicant and prays for rejection of the application.

5. Having gone through the charge-sheet and the relevant material collected by the IO during the investigation, it is evident that there are eye-witnesses to the incident. One of the witnesses, who got injured in the alleged incidence, in his statement named the applicant. It is the case of unlawful assembly with common intention and therefore, the submission of the learned counsel for the applicant that no role is attributed to the applicant, is not material. The Post Mortem report shows that 43 chop injuries were found on the body of the deceased, which further shows that the deceased was brutally killed.

6. In the circumstances, as there are four eyewitnesses to the incident and as the involvement of the applicant is *prima facie* apparent, I am not inclined to grant bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(ANIL S. KILOR, J)