

Harish

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 867 OF 2025

Sunil @ Kaka Vishnu Shinde	...Applicant
Versus	
The State Of Maharashtra	...Respondent

HARISH
VITHAL
CHAUDHARI

Digitally signed
by HARISH
VITHAL
CHAUDHARI
Date:
2025.11.14
18:51:34 +0530

Mr. Omkar C. Tolem a/w Sachin Wagh & Shivraj Chavan Advocate
for the Applicant.

Mr. S. H. Yadav, APP for the Respondent-State.

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.
DATE : 13th NOVEMBER, 2025.

P.C.

1. Applicant is seeking regular bail in crime no. 461 of 2024 registered with Karmala Police Station, Solapur Rural, Dist-Solapur for the offences punishable under Sections 103, 333 and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023.

2. It is prosecution's case that on 17th July 2024 at around 8:30 p.m. when the first informant, her daughter, grand daughter, son and daughter-in-law were present in their house, at that time, some unknown persons wielding sickles, barged in their house. The first informant and her daughter locked themselves in one room, but, the

unknown persons broke open the door of said room and assaulted the daughter of first informant with sickle. In the said assault, the daughter of first informant was died. It is alleged that accused no.1, who is the husband of the deceased, had given contract of killing of deceased i.e. his wife, to the present applicant and thereafter, the present applicant had given the said contract to accused nos. 4, 5 and 6.

3. It is the contention of learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant is behind bar more than 1 year. The applicant was not present at the time of incident. There is no recovery at the instance of the applicant. The applicant has no antecedents, hence, requested to allow the application.

4. It is contention of learned APP that the accused no.1, who had dispute with deceased wife had given contract of killing of his wife to the present applicant and then the applicant had given the said contract to accused nos. 4, 5 and 6. There is involvement of the applicant in the crime. The amount of Rs.90,000/- is recovered at the instance of the applicant. If the applicant released on bail, he may abscond or threaten the prosecution witnesses, hence, requested to reject the application.

5. I have heard both learned counsel, perused the FIR and

documents produced on record.

6. The applicant was not present at the time of incident. The allegation against him that the accused no. 1 had given contract of killing of his wife to the present applicant and the present applicant had given further contract to accused nos. 4, 5 and 6. To prove the role of the applicant, evidence is required. Applicant is behind bar more than 1 year. It may take time to conclude the trial. Considering these facts, I pass following order:

ORDER

- I. The applicant be enlarged on bail in crime no. 461 of 2024 registered with Karmala Police Station, Solapur Rural, Dist-Solapur on executing P. R.Bond in the sum of Rs.20,000/- with one or two sureties in the like amount.
 - II. The applicant shall attend the Court dates regularly.
 - III. The applicant shall not tamper with the evidence or attempt to influence or contact the complainant, witnesses or any person concerned with the case.
7. The application is allowed in the aforesaid terms and is accordingly disposed off.
8. It is made clear that the above observations are made only for the purpose of granting bail and the Trial Court shall decide the case

on its own merits in accordance with law and uninfluenced by the observations made in this order.

9. All concerned to act on the authenticated copy of this order.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)