



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

**BAIL APPLICATION NO. 135 OF 2025**

Jaydeep s/o Dattatray Surankar,  
Age : 24 years, Occupation Agriculture,  
R/o. Chimbhale, Taluka Shrigonda,  
District Ahmednagar.

... Applicant  
[Orig. Accused]

Versus

The State of Maharashtra  
Through the Police Inspector,  
Belwandi Police Station,  
Taluka Shrigonda, District Aurangabad.

... Respondent

.....  
Mr. V. S. Wakale, Advocate for the Applicant.  
Mr. V. M. Chate, APP for Respondent-State.

.....

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

Reserved on : 03.04.2025

Pronounced on : 07.04.2025

**ORDER :**

1. Applicant seeks enlargement on regular bail on account of his arrest in crime no. 0491 of 2023 registered at Belwandi Police Station, District Ahmednagar for offences punishable under Sections 307, 120(B), 201 r/w 34 of IPC and Sections 3/25 and 27 of the Arms Act.

2. Learned counsel submitted that, applicant is falsely implicated. That, applicant is behind bars since 16.10.2023 regarding some occurrence dated 10.11.2023. Learned counsel emphasized that this Court, in previous Bail Application No. 515 of 2024 moved by the present applicant, had directed expeditious disposal of the case. That, said order dated 22.04.2024 is not complied. Trial is proceeding at snail's pace and only one witness is examined. That, there is no fault on the part of the present applicant for delay in trial.

3. Learned APP pointed out that trial has already commenced. Learned APP took this Court through the *roznama* and pointed out that from the same, it is evident that on last date, counsel for the accused had remained absent and as such, according to him, trial is getting prolonged at the instance of accused persons.

4. After considering the above submissions and on going through the papers, it seems that in the FIR dated 11.10.2023, applicant has been arrested on 16.10.2023. In view of the statement made across the bar by learned APP, now trial has already commenced. No doubt this Court had, in earlier order, directed to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible and in any case within six months from the date of said order. Apparently, from the *roznama* at least it is seen

that counsel for the accused remained absent. Therefore, once trial is commenced, it is not proper to consider prayers for bail. However, this Court reposes trust in the learned trial court that, it would make sincere endeavor to conclude the trial as early as possible. Hence, I proceed to pass the following order :

**ORDER**

The application is rejected.

**[ABHAY S. WAGHWASE, J.]**

vre