



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

917 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1594 OF 2025

ARJUN ALIAS APPA BHAGWAN AHIRE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

AND
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 4013 OF 2025 IN BA/1594/2025
(ASSIST TO APP)

PRASHANT DAGAJIRAO PATIL
VERSUS
ARJUN ALIAS APPA BHAGWAN AHIRE AND ANOTHER

...
Advocate for applicant : Mr. M.A. Manav i/b. S.H. Jadhav
(Through VC) (BA/1594/2025)
APP for the respondent – State : Mr. S.M. Ganachari
Advocate for applicant/informant: Mr. C.C. Deshpande (Cr. Appln. 4013/2025)
...

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 5 DECEMBER 2025

PER COURT :

1. The applicant has presented this Bail Application seeking regular bail in connection with Crime No. 75 of 2018 dated 08.06.2018 registered with Devpur West Police Station, District – Dhule for the offences punishable under section 302, 307, 341, 120(B), 109, 143, 147, 148, 149 of the Indian Penal Code, under section 4/25 of Arms Act, under section 37(1)(3), 135 of Maharashtra Police Act.

2. The prosecution case is that a murder of two individuals occurred on 08/06/2018, stemming from an ongoing dispute between

families led by accused Bajirao Pawar and deceased Raosaheb Patil. On the day of the incident, informant Prashant (Raosaheb's younger brother) received a report that accused Rhushikesh Patil was following Hitesh Patil, which raised suspicion as Hitesh was going to deliver medicine to Raosaheb. Prashant, with relatives, immediately left to meet his brother. While passing accused Jayraj Patil's house, they found seven accused namely (Gaurav, Jayraj, Rhushikesh, Sonu, Harshal, Bhupesh, and Bhushan) intercepting Raosaheb, his son Vaibhav, and Harish Shinde, who were in a Scorpio vehicle. Multiple witnesses saw the accused commit a brutal assault on Raosaheb and Vaibhav using deadly weapons, including a sword, scythe, Kukri, and iron rod. The accused inflicted numerous blows to vital body parts. Both victims were taken to the hospital; Vaibhav was declared dead on arrival, and Raosaheb died shortly after. Consequently, the report was lodged.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is not named in the First Information Report and is falsely implicated in the alleged crime. It is further submitted that two co-accused, namely Darshan Pardeshi and Bajirao Pawar, have been released on bail. The applicant is similarly situated and is thus entitled to parity. The applicant has been in jail for the past seven years, and as the trial is taking time to conclude, it prayed that applicant be released on bail.

4. The APP for the State and the counsel for the original complainant vehemently opposed the bail application. They submit that the applicant is involved in a case of double murder involving brutality and that the material on record is sufficient to show the applicant's complicity. The Learned APP further submits that there is no change in circumstances since the last application, and as such, this successive application for bail does not warrant consideration. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

5. Having heard the submissions of both sides and upon perusal of the material on record, including the chargesheet, it is evident that the trial has substantially progressed. The communication from the office of the District Government Pleader dated 04/12/2025 indicates that the matter is posted for final arguments on 08/12/2025.

6. The applicant's earlier applications have been rejected, and there is no change in circumstances. The solitary ground put forth by the applicant is the delay in the trial, however, in view of communication indicating stage of trial, same is also, now, not available to the applicant. Thus, in the absence of any new grounds as well as in the absence of a change in circumstances, I am not inclined to exercise discretion in favor of the applicant.

7. Resultantly, the Bail Application is **rejected**.

8. The Criminal Application No. 4013 of 2025, seeking to assist the APP, is allowed and disposed of.

9. Needless to state that the observations rendered herein-above are to the extent of consideration of the bail application and the trial judge shall not get influenced by these observations and shall consider the case on the basis of evidence on record and in accordance with law.

[SACHIN S. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE

arp/