



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

BAIL APPLICATION NO.626 OF 2025

SANDIP SAKHARAM KOKATE,
Age: 39, Occu.: Doctor

.. Applicant

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA,
Through P. I. Police Station,
Chaklamba, Tq. Gevrao, Dist. Beed

..Respondent

...
WITH

...
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1593 OF 2025

...
Advocate for Applicant:
Mr. V. D. Salunke h/f. Mr. M. V. Salunke
Advocate for Assist to PP: Mr. S. B. Ghatol Patil
APP for the Respondent/State: G. O. Wattamwar
...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 08.08.2025

ORDER :

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, the learned APP for the respondent-State and the learned counsel for the assist to public prosecutor.

2. Criminal Application No.1593 of 2025 is allowed in terms of prayer clause "B".

3. The applicant is seeking bail as he was arrested on 16.07.2024 in connection with Crime No.0199/2024, dated 15.07.2024, registered with Chaklamba Police Station, Taluka Gevrai, District Beed, for the offences punishable under Sections 103(3), 85, 115(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

4. This court by order dated 14.01.2025, passed in BA/2207/2024, rejected the bail application to the extent of the present applicant and, at paragraphs no.5 and 6, observed as under:

“5. Heard. Perused the papers. Above crime seems to be at the instance of Harshad Kalambe, who is brother of deceased Pratiksha. He has reported on 15.07.2024 that, his sister was married with applicant no.1 on 05.02.2022. He has alleged that, after one month, there was humiliation, insult, taunting to his sister on accusation of giving less dowry. He has alleged that, sister was continuously beaten and demand of Rs.5,00,000/- was allegedly made and his sister reported about demand and ill treatment and as such understanding was given to the accused by indulging relatives. He has alleged that, on 14.07.2024, poison was administered to his sister as a result of which she died. Hence, the report.

6. Perused the charge-sheet containing statements of relatives, who have informed that there was maltreatment after one month of marriage, for giving less dowry, for not giving proper honour, and that there was demand of Rs.5,00,000/-. They all claimed that she reported about it and that understanding was

required to be given to the husband and in-laws. Now, report is lodged by brother that there was murder by administration of poison. Even P.M. report shows cause of death due to poisoning, however, autopsy surgeon has preserved viscera of C.A. and its report is to be received. Learned APP pointed out that, there is recovery at the instance of applicant no.1. Learned counsel has also pointed out that, after the occurrence, mother-in-law of deceased i.e. mother of applicant no.1 and wife of applicant no.2 was beaten and she died due to multiple contusion injuries. Present applicant no.2 reportedly shifted deceased Pratiksha to hospital, is not denied by prosecution. He is shown to be 65 years of age and statement is made across the bar by learned counsel for applicants that he is patient of heart ailment and has recently undergone angioplasty.”

5. Thereafter, the present bail application is filed before this court. This court, on 17.04.2025 issued notice, and on 08.05.2025 called report of the trial judge about proposed calendar for the trial and as to approximately how much time would be required to conclude the trial. In response thereto, the trial judge submitted the report dated 26.05.2025 and stated therein that the present case and the counter case are pending before it and the advocates appearing for concerned accused in both the matters are requesting the court to adjourn the matter on the say that compromise talks are going on and, thus, the matter could not proceed further. The trial judge further specifically mentioned in the report that the

learned APP has submitted that he has filed purshis to examine witnesses, however, the matter was adjourned on account of negotiation talks.

6. The learned APP and the learned counsel for the assist to public prosecutor prayed for rejection of the bail application.

7. Considering the above conspectus of the matter and dismissal of the bail application at earlier point of time by this court, no case is made out for interference. However, liberty is reserved for the applicant to file a fresh bail application, in the event, the trial does not conclude within one (01) year, subject to the parties co-operating with the trial.

8. The Bail Application stands disposed of accordingly.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER]
JUDGE