

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 3400 OF 2025**

Pratik Sambhaji Vagare ...Applicant  
Versus  
The State Of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. Ramanik P. Pawar a/w Dinsehs S. Sonarlikar, Amit W. Mr. Parvez Nadaf & Rahul G. Gupta Advocate for the Applicant.  
Mr. S. H. Yadav, APP for the Respondent-State.  
PC S. M. Kamble, MIDC Police Station.

**CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.  
DATE : 4<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER, 2025.**

**P.C.**

1. By this application, applicant is seeking regular bail in Crime No.114 of 2023 registered with MIDC Kupwada Police Station, Sangli Dist-Sangli for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 120-B, 109 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and under Sections 4, 25 of the Arms Act.

2. It is prosecution's case that on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2023 around 9.15 p.m., applicant and co-accused assaulted the nephew of the first informant with sharp weapons and murdered him.

3. It is contention of learned counsel for applicant that applicant is behind bar for more than 2 years and 6 months. There is no progress in trial. The main allegations are against accused no. 1. There are

IRESH  
MASHAL

Digitally  
signed by  
IRESH  
MASHAL  
Date:  
2025.11.07  
10:06:16  
+0530

discrepancies in the statement of eye witnesses. Hence, requested to allow the application.

4. It is the contention of learned APP that that incident is witnessed by eye witnesses. Eye witness Santosh Kadam was present at the time of incident. He has specifically stated that the applicant stabbed in the chest and stomach of the deceased with a sharp weapon. Eye witness Dhondiram Kharat also stated the same fact. The charge is framed. The trial is in progress. Hence, requested to reject the application.

5. I have heard both learned counsel, perused the FIR and documents produced on record. The incident happened in the presence of Santosh Kadam. He has stated that applicant had stabbed in the chest and stomach of the deceased with a sharp weapon. Other eye witnesses have also stated the same fact. The incident took place in a public place. As there is direct evidence against the applicant, I am not inclined to allow the application.

6. In view of above, I pass following order:

**ORDER**

(i) The application is rejected.

**(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)**