

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

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2812 OF 2024

Ajay @ Aajya Sharad @ Shreya Bhosale .Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra .Respondent

Mr. Akash R. Pandey, Advocate, for the Applicant
Mrs. Geeta P. Mulekar, APP, for the Respondent - State

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR, J.

DATE : 29.11.2024

P. C.

1. By this Application, the Applicant seeks regular bail in connection with C. R. No. 158 of 2021 registered with the Baramati Police Station, Pune (Rural), for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 394, 452, 506 r/w. 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. Learned Counsel for the Applicant submits that he has been falsely implicated in the alleged offences and even if the FIR is considered, it is evident that faces of the Accused were covered with mask. It is submitted that despite this fact, by showing faces of the Accused on mobile, identification was done. He, therefore, submitted that this is a fit case for grant of bail to the Applicant.

3. On the other hand, learned APP strongly opposes the Bail Application. She points out that there is a recovery of stolen Mangalsutra at the instance of the present Applicant. Thus, recovery sufficiently connects the Applicant with the alleged offences. She further points out that there are 16 antecedents of similar nature against the Applicant.

4. Considering the fact that stolen Mangalsutra was recovered from the Applicant under Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, *Prima face*, there is a material to show the complicity of the Applicant in the alleged offences. Further more, considering the fact that there are 16 antecedents against the Applicant, there is every likelihood that if the Applicant is released on bail, he may commit similar offence. In the circumstances, I am not inclined to grant bail to the Applicant. Hence, the Bail Application is rejected.

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)