

sg

6.appln262-25.docx

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

Criminal Application No.262 of 2025

Rajesh Sonaba Sonawane

Age: 49 years; Occ: Agriculturist

Residing at Patas, Taluka Daund,

District Pune

... Applicant

versus

1. Arun Baban Panasare,
Age 54 years, Occ:- Agriculturist

2. Kalpana Arun Panasare,
Age 49 years, Occ:- Agriculturist
Both Nos 1 and 2 residing at Patas, Taluka
Daund, District Pune

3. The State of Maharashtra
Through Yavat Police Station,
Yavat, Taluka Baramati,
District Pune.

... Respondents

Mr Abhijit Deshmukh, a/w. Mr Pritam N Nigade and Mr
Omkar Jadhav, for the applicant.

Mr Anand Shalgaonkar, APP, for respondent No.3/ State.

**Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.
Date: 7 July 2025.**

P.C.:

. Heard Mr Abhijit Deshmukh, the learned Counsel
appearing on behalf of the applicant; and Mr Anand

Shalgaonkar, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, representing respondent No.3/State.

2. The applicant has preferred this application seeking cancellation of pre-arrest bail granted to respondent No.2, by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Baramati, by an order dated 17 April 2025 in connection with CR No.284 of 2025, registered at Yavat Police Station, for the offences punishable under Sections 352, 351(2), 12(a) and 119(1) read with Section 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Samhita (BNS), 2023.

3. The applicant's contention is that the learned Judge failed to delve into the substantive merits of the prosecution's case at the time of granting bail, and respondent No.2 threatened the applicant.

4. It is a settled principle in law that at the preliminary bail stage, the Court should not undertake a detailed examination of the merits of the case. The primary consideration lies in the prima facie scrutiny of the material available on record. Furthermore, once granted, the bail should not be cancelled without compelling or extraordinary circumstances, such as the risk of jeopardising a fair trial.

5. Upon perusing the records, it appears that the dispute is of civil nature on the ground of ownership of the agricultural land and both the parties have filed litigation against each other. The injury certificate shows that the applicant has sustained abrasion and super facial laceration and the alleged injuries are simple in nature. The weapon, allegedly used in the crime, has already been recovered and nothing is to be recovered or discovered from the applicant. Furthermore, there is nothing on record to suggest that the accused/respondent No.2 interfered or attempted to interfere with the prosecution's evidence or influence the witnesses, and has misused the bail concession granted to him. In light of above, this Court is not inclined to revoke the pre-arrest bail granted to the accused/respondent No.2.

6. The application, accordingly, stands rejected.

(R.N. Laddha, J.)