

AGK

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

BAIL APPLICATION NO.1255 OF 2024

Loknath @ Logo Armogam Shetty	... Applicant
V/s.	
The State of Maharashtra	... Respondent

ATUL
GANESH
KULKARNI
Digitally signed by
ATUL GANESH
KULKARNI
Date: 2025.07.07
18:37:35 +0530

Mr. Prashant Pandey with Ms. Ridhima Mangaonkar
and Ms. Sumati Gupta i/by W3Legal LLP or the
applicant.

Mrs. Megha S. Bajoria, APP for the respondent-State.

CORAM : AMIT BORKAR, J.

DATED : JULY 7, 2025

P.C.:

1. The applicant has filed a praecipe seeking speaking to the minutes/modification of the order dated 23rd June 2025, with a prayer to incorporate nine additional points as mentioned in the said praecipe. It is necessary to consider whether such modification is legally permissible in the present case.

2. While deciding an application for bail under Section 439 of the Criminal Procedure Code, it is not necessary for the Court to separately record findings or deal with each and every submission raised by the applicant. What is expected from the Judge is not an exhaustive analysis or critical evaluation of the entire material placed on record, but only a prima facie consideration of whether the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail or not.

3. The Supreme Court in the case of *Niranjan Singh v. Prabhakar Rajaram Kharote*, (1980) 2 SCC 559, clearly held that while passing orders on bail, the Court should avoid detailed examination of evidence and lengthy documentation of merits. The Court emphasised that the order should not give an impression that the case has been prejudged, as the stage of bail is not meant for a full trial on facts. The Court must only see whether a *prima facie* case exists and whether there are grounds to grant or refuse bail.

4. Similarly, in *Vilas Pandurang Pawar v. State of Maharashtra*, (2012) 8 SCC 795, the Supreme Court again made it clear that at the stage of bail, the scope of appreciating evidence is very limited. The Judge is not supposed to do a critical analysis of the evidence or make final conclusions regarding guilt or innocence.

5. Further, in *Atulbhai Vithalbhai Bhanderi v. State of Gujarat*, (2023) 17 SCC 521, the Supreme Court reiterated these principles and underlined that while the Court must apply its judicial mind, it need not answer each argument separately. What is necessary is that the order must reflect that the Court has considered the overall circumstances of the case, including the nature of accusations, the role of the accused, the stage of investigation or trial, and any other relevant factors like possibility of tampering with evidence, threat to witnesses, or likelihood of fleeing from justice.

6. Therefore, a well-reasoned bail order can be brief, provided it shows that the Judge has taken into account the relevant legal

principles and material facts. The order must indicate that the Judge has applied his mind judiciously, even if all points are not mentioned or discussed in detail.

7. Moreover, this Court had, while passing the order dated 23rd June 2025, duly considered all submissions made by the parties, including the contentions now attempted to be introduced through the present praecipe. Therefore, it cannot be said that the nine points were overlooked or not considered by the Court. Judicial mind has already been applied to all aspects which were necessary for deciding the matter.

8. In view of the above discussion, this Court finds no merit in the present praecipe. Accordingly, the praecipe is rejected.

(AMIT BORKAR, J.)