



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**BAIL APPLICATION NO. 06 OF 2025**

1. Vijaya W/o. Kakasaheb More,  
Age : 54 Years, Occu. : Household,  
R/o. Vikram Nagar, Latur,  
Tq. & Dist. Latur.
2. Ajinkya @ Sonya S/o. Kakasaheb More,  
Age : 29 Years, Occu. : Business,  
R/o. Vikram Nagar, Latur,  
Tq. & Dist. Latur.

**... Applicants**

**VERSUS**

1. The State of Maharashtra,  
Through Superintendent of Police,  
Dist. Latur.
2. The Police Inspector,  
Bhada Police Station,  
Dist. Latur.

**... Respondents**

....  
Advocate for Applicants : Mr. Yogesh G. Birajdar  
APP for Respondents-State : Mr. P.K. Lakhotiya  
....

**CORAM : ABHAY S. WAGHWASE, J.**

**RESERVED ON : 24<sup>th</sup> February, 2025**

**PRONOUNCED ON : 26<sup>th</sup> February, 2025**

**ORDER :**

1. Both applicants seek grant of regular bail on account of their arrest in crime No.0075 of 2024, registered at Bhada Police Station, Dist. Latur, for offence under Sections 302, 323 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. Pointing to the date of arrest as 04.12.2024, learned counsel for the applicants submitted that, FIR is of dated 26.03.2024. That, present applicants are shown as accused Nos.3 & 4. That, applicant No.1 is a lady and applicant No.2 is her son. That, there is some civil dispute over a land and in that backdrop, it is alleged that, there was some incident of assault to informant's father.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants further submitted that, only allegation against the present applicants is that, they had caught hold of deceased i.e. informant's father. That, other accused with similar allegation is granted bail by this court vide order dated 12.06.2024. Therefore, on the ground of parity also, learned counsel seeks grant of bail.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed on the ground that, present applicants are directly named in FIR by son of deceased i.e.

informant. He took this court through the statements of one Mahesh Kulkarni and Govind Narvade and pointed out that, these witnesses have narrated the chronology of events. That, initially quarrel was resolved, but subsequently, present applicants again came in a vehicle. Learned APP further pointed out that, there are allegations that at around 07.30 p.m., one Rajendra Dagdu @ Bhairu Shinde and present applicants came and caught hold of father of informant and Santosh Dagdu @ Bhairu Shinde inflicted knife blows on various parts like back, face, neck and committed murder. That, serious crime is committed and hence, learned APP prayed for rejection of the application.

5. Heard. Perused the papers. FIR dated 26.03.2024 is at the instance of one Sadanand Shinde. The informant has reported the police that, after demise of his mother in 2002, he and his father went for work at Pune. That, after Covid lockdown was over, they came back to their native with intention to cultivate their 8 acres land. That time, step brothers of his father, namely, Rajendra Dagdu @ Bhairu Shinde, Chandrakant Dagdu @ Bhairu Shinde, Ramakant Dagdu @ Bhairu Shinde, Krushna Dagdu @ Bhairu Shinde and Santosh Dagdu @ Bhairu Shinde obstructed for the same.

6. The informant has alleged that, on 25.03.2024, step sister of his father namely, Vijaya More i.e. present applicant No.1 and her son i.e. present applicant No.2 came in Thar vehicle and issued threats to show him and his father within ten minutes. The informant claims to have managed to give jerk during the scuffle and managed to reach home and that he did not find his father and therefore, he went to look him and saw his father in injured condition near bus stop.

7. The informant further claims that, that time Ramakant and both present applicants had caught hold of his father, after which Santosh used sharp weapon and inflicted blows on his father. He has also named Sarpanch of the village Babruvan, pan stall owner Tanaji Sawant and others intervening. He has further reported that, those persons were approaching him and so he ran away from there.

8. It is, therefore, apparent from above statement that, initially, present applicants came in a vehicle and again threats to see and shortly thereafter, they were seen assaulting the informant's father and even chasing him. Therefore, with such material, though this court has granted bail to one co-accused namely, Ramakant Shinde, both present applicants are named initially for intercepting

the informant, scuffling with him and issuing threats and apparently the same are subsequently executed and therefore, their roles are distinguishable from one i.e. attributed to Ramakant. Even in statements of witnesses namely, Mahesh and Govind, roles of applicants are getting crystallized. Resultantly, ground of parity cannot be invoked.

9. Though learned counsel for the applicants tried to submit that there are variances in the statements of persons named in FIR, same cannot be considered or analyzed at this stage. Going through the very FIR and their direct evidence, this court is not inclined to grant any relief more particularly when charge-sheet is filed. Hence, following order is passed.

**ORDER**

The application stands rejected.

[ABHAY S. WAGHWASE, J.]