



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

19 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLN. NO. 315 OF 2025

**BALIRAM ASHOK BHALSING
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA**

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr.S.S.Kulkarni
APP for Respondent-State : Mr.B.B.Bhise
Advocate for Assist to P.P. : Mr.K.P.Rathod

...

**WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 760 OF 2025
IN ABA/315/2025**

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 10.03.2025

P.C. :

1] Heard. For the reasons stated in Criminal Application No.760 of 2025, the same is allowed. The Criminal Application is disposed of accordingly.

2] Heard the learned counsel for the applicant, learned APP for the respondent-State and the learned counsel for assisting to P.P.

3] The applicant is apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No. 13/2025, registered with Taluka

Jalna Police Station, Jalna, for the offence punishable under Sections 115 (2), 118 (2), 125 and 352 of the BNS, 2023.

4] The allegation against the applicant is that on 08.0.3035, when the informant went to his agricultural field, there was quarrel between the applicant and informant on account of electric motor and its functioning. Due to said dispute, the applicant has assaulted the informant by means of stone. Again the applicant has thrown down the informant and assaulted with stone on head.

5] The learned APP submits that there is antecedent against the applicant.

6] The learned counsel for the assist to P.P. submits that there is antecedent against the applicant. However, there is settlement between the parties in the said complaint.

7] It appears that the applicant has assaulted the informant by means of stone on head twice. The learned APP has produced injury certificate which shows undisplaced fracture involving left parietal bone and no significant abnormality detected in the brain parenchyma. In view of Section 116 (3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, the injury caused is 'grievous hurt'. Considering the grievous

injury sustained and the *prima facie* involvement of the applicant, no case is made out to grant anticipatory bail. Hence, the present application is dismissed.

8] It is also clarified that the observations made in this order are limited to the disposal of the present anticipatory bail application and the trial Court shall not be influenced by the observations of this Court while deciding regular bail or at trial.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER]
JUDGE

DDC