

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2816 OF 2024

Ravindra Subhash Varpe	...Applicant
<i>Versus</i>	
The State of Maharashtra and Anr.	...Respondents

Mr Vivek Arote a/w Adv. Akshay Dingale i/by Adv. Sumit Patil, for
the Applicant.
Mr Tanveer Khan, APP for the Respondent-State.
Ms. Komal Sinha, appointed advocate for the Respondent No. 2.

CORAM: S. M. MODAK, J.

DATED: 12th DECEMBER 2025.

PC:-

1. No one is present in the first session.
2. In second session, when matter is called out, it is submitted that arguing counsel Mr. Aniket Nikam is busy before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Adjournment is sought.
3. Learned APP and learned appointed Advocate for the Respondent No. 2 submitted that dilatory tactics on behalf of the Applicant. It is true on 03.09.2025, last chance was granted by this Court. According to the Respondent, delay is also before the trial court, because the defence advocate is not appearing. That is why, charge could not be framed.

4. There is submission that the transcript is not prepared. My attention is invited to the pendrive seizure panchnama, on page no. 89. I am not considering this submission for two reasons:-

- a) This can be agitated before the trial court.
- b) If transcript is required and not prepared, this ground can be taken by the Applicant, during arguments.

5. Considering the fact that these matters are assigned to me today only, I am accommodating the Applicant. It is expected that the learned Advocate who represents the Applicant before the trial court is supposed to co-operate the trial court. I am only recording the submission and not making any observations, because it is submitted that delay in trial is not ground taken in this court. Copy of this order be informed to the trial court.

6. Stand over to 09th January 2026.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)