

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**  
**INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 2519 OF 2024**  
**IN**  
**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 751 OF 2024**

Rangya @ Rangnath Banshi Jadhav

... Appellant/  
Applicant

versus

The State of Maharashtra

.... Respondent

.....

Mr. Satyavrat Joshi a/w. Mr. Ishan Paradkar, Ms. Indrayanee Pandit, Mr. Samay Pawar and Mr. Priyesh More, Advocates for Appellant in Cri. Appeal 751/2024.

Mr. H. J. Dedhia, APP for the State.

Mr. Prabhakar Ranshur, Advocate for the Appellant in Criminal Appeal No. 571/2024.

**CORAM : R. M. JOSHI, J.**

**DATE : 15<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER, 2025.**

Digitally signed  
by SONALI  
SATISH  
KILAJE  
Date: 2025.12.17  
14:27:13  
+0700

**P.C. :**

1. None for the intervenor.
2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant /appellant and learned APP.
3. It is the contention of learned counsel for the appellant that similarly this accused has been granted bail on 24.10.2024. It is his submission that except for one eye witness of the incident, there is no other evidence to indicate the exact occurrence of the incident in which injured sustained injuries.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that only eye witness has not named the present appellant to be the person who caused assault on the injured. Similarly, it is his contention that accused Bapu @ Chandrakant B. Bhondave has been released on bail by this Court by this Court by order dated 24.10.2024, qua having regard to the similar role attributed to the present appellant, he deserves to be enlarged on bail. It is also argued that appellant has already spent more than two years in jail.

5. Learned APP opposed the application by stating seriousness of the crime.

6. Though 11 witnesses are examined, prima facie perusal of the evidence indicates that except for PW-3, none of the witness claims to have seen the incident in question. He however does not name the present appellant to be the assailant or the one who was present at the spot of incident. Similar is the case of the co-accused Bapu who is enlarged on bail. The appellant has already undergone above two years period behind bar. The sentence imposed is for fixed term. Appeal is not likely to be heard in short time. Hence, parity applies. Application deserves to be allowed.

7. In view of above, following order:

#### **ORDER**

(i) Substantive sentence imposed against the applicant by

order dated 16.03.2024 passed in Sessions Case No. 437 of 2007 stands suspended till decision of the appeal.

- (ii) The applicant be enlarged on bail on furnishing P.R.Bond of Rs.25,000/- with one or two surety in the like amount.

9. Interim Application is allowed in the aforesaid terms and is accordingly disposed of.

**(R. M. JOSHI, J.)**