

one Akash @ Akshay Shinde. According to the prosecution, the present applicant and other co-accused were thus annoyed with the deceased and decided to commit her murder as the act of the deceased was causing damage to their reputation. It is alleged that they thus hatched the conspiracy and pursuant to the said conspiracy, they took her to bridge on Dudhganga river within the limits of Danwad Village, Shirol and pushed her in the said river and committed her murder.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and learned A.P.P for the Respondent-State.

5. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the material on record is not consistent with the prosecution case. It is submitted that the applicant is in jail for more than three years and seven months and the trial has not commenced. It is further submitted that this Court has already released the other co-accused on bail.

6. On the other hand, the learned A.P.P for the Respondent-State submits that the applicant is involved in serious crime. It is submitted that it's case of honour killing. It is submitted that the son of the present applicant is an eye

witness to the incident. It is submitted that the role attributed to the present applicant and the co-accused to whom this Court had granted bail is altogether different.

7. I have perused the statement of the son of the present applicant namely Rajwardhan recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. According to him, the present applicant had pushed the deceased in the river. Considering the nature of offence, I am not inclined to release the applicant on bail. The application is rejected.

8. Considering the fact that the applicant is in jail for more than three years, the trial Court shall endeavour to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible.

(N. R. BORKAR, J.)