

sg

1.appln24-24.docx

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

Criminal Application No.24 of 2024

Sangita Raju Changaudar
Age: 35, Occ: Household,
R/o. :Khilegaon, Tal: Athani,
Dist. Belgaon, Karnataka State

... Applicant

versus

1. Basavraj Daryappa Bagli,
Age: 28, Occ: Agri.,
2. Shiv @ Shivanand Shrimant Alikatti,
Age: 24, Occ: Agri.,
3. Mahantesh Dharwade,
Age: 35, Occ: Agri.,
4. Sanjay @ Santosh Ramgonda Dharwade,
Age: 28, Occ: Agri.,
5. Dipak Ramesh Shivagol @ Pujari,
Age: 40, Occ: Agri.,
6. Pandurang Devnath Pujari,
Age: 28, Occ: Agri.,
7. Vinayak Sadashiv Tagli,
Age: 27, Occ: Agri.,
8. Chetan Jutti,
Age: 24, Occ: Agri.,

9. Sachin Vhannagol,
Age: 26, Occ: Agri.,
 10. Sou Laxmi Daryappa Bagli,
Age: 45, Occ: Agri.,
 11. Nilwa Ishwar Andani,
Age: 58, Occ: Agri.,
 12. Shrimant Alikatti,
Age: 45, Occ: Agri.,
 13. Sou Sujata Shrimant Alikatti,
Age: 39, Occ: Agri.,
All R/o. Khilegaon, Tal: Athani
Dist: Belgavi
 14. The State of Maharashtra
Through Kavathemahankal
Police Station, Sangli
- ... Respondents

Mr Kuldeep Nikam, for the applicant.
Mr Sachin Hande, a/w. Ms Tanvi Phatak and Ms Komal Gosavi,
for respondents No.1 to 13.
Mr Arfan Sait, APP, for the respondent/ State.
PC AA Landge, Kavathemahankal Police Station, Sangli, is
present.

Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.
Date: 7 August 2025.

P.C.:

. Heard Mr Kuldeep Nikam, the learned Counsel appearing
on behalf of the applicant; Mr Sachin Hande, the learned
Counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.1 to 13; and

Mr Arfan Sait, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, representing the respondent/State.

2. The applicant has preferred this application seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondents No.1 to 13 in Criminal Bail Application No.315 of 2023, by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangli, vide order dated 17 April 2023, registered at Kavathemahankal Police Station, Sangli, in connection with CR No.38 of 2023, for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 326, 324, 323, 504, 506, 427, 143, 147 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The applicant's contention is that the learned Judge failed to adequately examine the substantive merits of the prosecution's case and did not consider the gravity of the offence.

4. Upon perusing the records, it appears that the alleged offence occurred on 31 January 2023 and FIR has been lodged on 1 February 2023. It further appears that the investigation in the present matter has been duly concluded, and a charge-sheet has also been filed in July 2024. Moreover, there is nothing on record to indicate that the accused/respondents No.1 to 13 at any point during the course of investigation, attempted to

interfere with the investigation, tamper with evidence, or exert any undue influence over prosecution witnesses. The records do not reflect any instance of misuse of the liberty extended to the accused through the grant of pre-arrest bail. The learned Additional Sessions Judge, while adjudicating the application for anticipatory bail, has confined his analysis to the *prima facie* material on record and has exercised discretion judiciously taking into account the relevant circumstances of the case.

5. With the investigation having reached its conclusion, there remains no necessity for custodial interrogation of respondents No.1 to 13. In the absence of any fresh or compelling circumstances having emerged subsequent to the grant of pre-arrest bail, this Court finds no cogent ground to interfere with or set aside the said relief already granted to the respondents.

6. In light of the above, the application stands rejected.

(R.N. Laddha, J.)