



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1940 OF 2025

Ramu Alias Rama Bandu Chitre

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra

...

- Mr. R. G. Hange, Advocate for Applicant
- Mr. R. S. Wani, APP for Respondent - State

...

CORAM : MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.

DATED : 13.11.2025

PER COURT :

1. The applicant has filed the present application, seeking regular bail in connection with FIR bearing Crime No. 270 of 2024, dated 14.11.2024, registered with Beed City Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 103, 49 read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the informant received information on 14.11.2025 that his brother Mazhar was found lying near the Madki cremation ground, whereupon he reached the spot and found him dead in a pool of blood. It is alleged that Mazhar was having illicit relations with co-accused Anita Admane, and the informant suspected that she and co-accused Limbraj Kanade had

caused his death. In his supplementary statement, the informant stated that the present applicant and co-accused Ganesh Mane had earlier threatened Mazhar to discontinue the said relationship and had allegedly admitted before the informant and family members on 16.11.2024 that they had committed the murder.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is not named in the FIR and is attributed a role only in the supplementary statement of the informant and the other witnesses. It is further submitted that the statements recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, 2023, are also not corroborated with the earlier statements recorded by the Investigating Officer under Section 162 of the Cr.P.C. There are no eyewitnesses to the actual incident and the postmortem does not specify which injuries were sufficient in the ordinary course of nature to cause death. It is further submitted that the applicant has been in custody since 15.11.2024, and further detention is not necessary and the applicant may be released on bail.

4. As against this, the learned APP submits that the applicant is having criminal antecedents and has suppressed six FIRs registered against him. Out of them, five relates to serious offences. It is submitted that if the applicant is released on bail, there is a likelihood of his indulging in similar offences, threatening prosecution witnesses, tampering with evidence, and absconding from the trial.

5. The learned APP further submits that though there are no eyewitnesses to the actual incident, the witnesses have consistently stated about the role of the present applicant in threatening the deceased on account of his relationship with Anita. The statement of the Hina - wife of the deceased, recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. also supports the allegations in the FIR. The recovery of blood-stained clothes of the applicant and the discovery of the wooden rod at his instance under a memorandum punchanama further corroborate the prosecution case. It is submitted that the prosecution has collected sufficient material to establish the involvement of the applicant.

6. I have gone through the memo of the application, wherein the applicant has suppressed the fact of having criminal antecedents. The learned APP has produced before this Court a copy of the say filed before the prosecution, which is also not annexed by the applicant, and which mentions six other bodily offences registered against him. On the ground of suppression of facts, the application itself could have been rejected. Nevertheless, I have considered the application on merits as well. The record shows that the deceased was subjected to serious threats by the applicant and another accused on account of his relationship with Anita.

7. The applicant was arrested on 15.11.2024, and his memorandum was recorded, leading to the discovery of the wooden stick allegedly used in the commission of the offence. The blood-stained clothes recovered from the applicant at the time of arrest further strengthen the prosecution case. Even though there are no eyewitnesses, the material collected during investigation is, in my view, sufficient to prima facie connect the applicant with the offence of murder.

8. Insofar as the apprehension of the learned APP that the applicant, if released on bail, may again commit similar offences, may threaten witnesses or tamper with the prosecution evidence, is also well-founded, looking to the criminal antecedents of the applicant, including one offence punishable with life imprisonment or up to ten years, along with a fine (Section 326 IPC, though he is stated to have been acquitted), I am of the opinion that this is not a fit case for exercising discretion in favour of the applicant.

9. Hence, the Bail Application stands **rejected**.

(MEHROZ K. PATHAN, J.)