



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

965 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1799 OF 2025

Satish Alias Khokya Niralya Bhosale

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra

...

Mr. Bhagure Pralhad Chagan, Advocate for Applicant

Mr. N. B. Patil, APP for Respondent State

Mr. Shashikant E. Shekade, Advocate for Respondent No.2

CORAM : SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 14th October, 2025

ORDER:

1. Heard.

2. This is an application, under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short “the BNSS”), for grant of regular bail in connection with Crime No. 55 of 2025, registered with Shirur Police Station, District Beed, for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 353, 351(2), 351(3), 189(2), 191(2), 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, “the BNS”) and section 4/25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant pointed out the report in which the informant averred that on 19.02.2025, at about 7.30 a.m., he saw that two nets were set on his agricultural field in which a deer was trapped. That time, the informant saw that co-accused Bhausahab Niralya Bhosale was there. The informant questioned him why he had

set the nets on his agricultural field. That time he abused him. Then he called Sainath Bhosale and other two persons. The accused Bhausahab and Sainath Bhosale beaten the informant with iron rod on his back and shin. He cried loudly. That time his son Mahesh came there. Then co-accused Sainath made a phone call and called some other persons in the farm of the informant. After some time, at about 08.00 a.m. two vehicles, one black colour Scorpio and one white colour Swift Car came there. Applicant Satish alongwith his brother-in-law came out from Scorpio vehicle while other co-accused Harkya and Nirlya Bhole came out from Swift car and they came towards the informant armed with an axe. The applicant Satish hit the informant with axe on his mouth due to which ten teeth of the informant fell down. Co-accused Harkya assaulted Mahesh with opposite side of a sickle on his left knee and fractured him. Thereafter they all came and beat them. The informant become unconscious. The applicant and other accused then went away with deer. The informant was admitted in the Hospital for treatment. Thereafter the report was lodged.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant is falsely implicated in the crime. He submits that the incident took place on 19.02.2025 and report was lodged on 06.03.2025, though the informant was discharged by the Doctor on 28.02.2025. The delay is not properly explained. The applicant is falsely implicated in the crime. He has roots in the society and he will

not flee away from the trial. Trial will take a long period. Though he has a criminal antecedents, this not an obstacle for granting bail. He lastly prayed for grant of bail.

5. The learned APP strongly opposed the application. He submits that the applicant is involved in a serious crime and he has serious criminal antecedents, about which the trial court has observed in the order refusing to grant bail. If the applicant is released on bail, he will pressurize the prosecution witnesses and tamper with the evidence. The possibility of commission of a similar nature of crime again on the part of the applicant also cannot be ruled out, if he is released on bail. While in the jail also he had committed a crime. He was found in possession of Ganja and, therefore, is being prosecuted for for it. It is lastly prayed to reject the application.

6. Perused the charge-sheet, particularly the report and statements of witnesses. The injury certificate shows grievous injury sustained by the informant. His son also sustained serious injuries. The applicant seriously attacked during the assault and informant sustained injury to his face and he lost 10 teeth because of the assault. If the applicant is released on bail, he will pressurize the prosecution witnesses and tamper with the evidence. The possibility of commission of similar nature of crime again on the part of the applicant also cannot be ruled out, if he is released on bail. Considering the seriousness of the incident and serious overt act of the applicant, he is certainly not

entitled for grant of bail, even on the principle of bail is rule and jail is exception. Therefore, the application is rejected.

(SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, J.)

JPChavan