



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

908 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 668 OF 2025

BUNTY GULAB RAHASE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...
Advocate for applicant : Mr. Suniket A. Kulkarni and Ms. Rutuja L. Jakhade
APP for the respondent – State : Mr. S.M. Ganachari
...

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 2 DECEMBER 2025

PER COURT :

The applicant has approached this Court for grant of regular bail in connection with Crime No. 351 of 2024 registered with Taloda Police Station, District - Nandurbar for the offences punishable under section 115(2), 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, in connection with which the applicant is arrested on 29.11.2024.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the informant is the brother of the deceased, Chandrakant, who worked at Pragati Xerox center in Taloda, primarily filling online forms. The applicant availed the services from Chandrakant to prepare a Caste Validity certificate. The deceased did not complete the entrusted work, leading to a quarrel between the applicant and the deceased on the evening of 28/11/2024. Subsequently, on 29/11/2024, the body was discovered at Nimaji Valvi's welding workshop. The informant

suspected that the applicant murdered Chandrakant due to the previous evening's argument, and consequently, lodged a police report.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has not committed the alleged crime and has been falsely implicated. Furthermore, it is pointed that a co-accused, Mahada Aamsha Thakare, was released on bail by this Court, in Bail Application No. 120 of 2025. Therefore, the applicant deserves bail on the ground of parity. The applicant also has no prior criminal antecedents. Hence, prayed to allow the application.

4. The learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the application submitting that the offence is serious in nature and that the investigating officer has collected sufficient evidence to show complicity of the applicant. It is submitted that the role of the present applicant is distinct from the co-accused. Since, the applicant was the last person seen with the deceased prior to the alleged incident, making him the main accused in the case. If the applicant is released on bail, the A.P.P. has expressed the apprehension that applicant may threaten or pressurize prosecution witnesses. As such, prayed not to release the applicant on bail.

5. Having heard the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned A.P.P. for the State and upon perusal of the, including the chargesheet, it is, *prima facie*, evident that the deceased was last seen in the company of the applicant and investigating authority has recorded statements of the witnesses to that effect and *prima facie* there is overwhelming evidence on record to connect the applicant.

6. Furthermore, the motive of the applicant pertains to the prelude in the incident of earlier day. On account of the issue of certificate to be obtained from the Scheduled Caste Certificate Scrutiny Committee has resulted into the incident. Hence, prima facie, there is sufficient material to indicate active involvement of the applicant in the crime.

7. Perusal of the record indicates that the present applicant's role is demonstrably distinct from that of the co-accused granted bail on parity. The applicant's alleged actions involve a different degree of culpability and potentially more direct involvement. Therefore, the factual matrix indicating dissimilarities between the respective roles preclude the application of the parity. As such, request of applicant to claim the parity does not warrant consideration.

8. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.

[SACHIN S. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE

arp/