



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

**938 ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 590 OF 2025**

Sachin Vishnu Ransing

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Dushing Sanjay B

APP for Respondents-State: Mr. B. B. Bhise

...

**CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.**

**Dated : May 06, 2025.**

**PER COURT :-**

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the applicant and the learned APP.
2. The FIR is registered against the co-accused, alleging that they had threatened the deceased and assaulted him with a weapon. However, during the inquest *panchanama*, it was revealed that the deceased had died due to a bullet injury to the head, and a gunshot wound was found on the deceased's head. The accused have since been arrested. It is stated that while in custody, one of the accused disclosed that the applicant was the person who had supplied the firearm used in the offence.
3. The learned Counsel for the applicant submits that there is no material on record directly connecting the applicant to the present crime. It is contended that the applicant has no criminal antecedents and has neither sold any weapon to the accused nor played any role in the alleged offence. It is further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the applicant is not warranted for the purpose of investigation.
4. However, having regard to the serious nature of the offence and the

fact that a co-accused has named the applicant as the source of the weapon, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail at this stage. *Prima facie*, the cause of death is a bullet injury to the head. The weapon used in the offence is yet to be recovered, and the investigation is at a crucial stage. In the absence of sufficient material to rule out the applicant's involvement and in view of the ongoing investigation, no case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail at this juncture.

5. Accordingly, the application is dismissed.

( ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J. )

*vj gawade/-.*