

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

Bail Application No.213 of 2025

Satish Bhimrao Bhalsingh
An adult Indian Inhabitant
Age: 37 yrs, R/of village Khamgaon,
Taluka Daund, Zilla Pune
(Presently at Yerwada Central
Prison, Pune)

... Applicant.

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra
(through PI, Yawat PS)

..... Respondent.

Ms Deepti Chand, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr SS Pednekar, APP for the respondent / State.

**Coram : R.N.Laddha, J.
Date : 19 September 2025.**

P.C. :

By this application, the applicant seeks bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in connection with CR No. 834 of 2022 registered with Yawat Police Station, Pune Rural, for the offences punishable under Sections 279, 304-A, 337, 338, 302 and 120-B read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) and under Sections 184, 134, 177 of the Maharashtra Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.

2. The learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the

applicant, has vehemently asserted the applicant's innocence and contended that he has been falsely implicated in the present crime. It is submitted that, save and except the statement of the informant, who is the father of the deceased, there exists no other incriminating material on record that *prima facie* establishes any nexus between the applicant and the alleged incident. The learned Counsel further submits that the statement of the informant is inherently unreliable and suffers from material inconsistencies. Specifically, it is pointed out that the informant has alleged that the deceased was assaulted on the head by two individuals using an iron rod. However, the post-mortem report does not attribute the cause of the head injury to any specific weapon. It is further submitted that the investigation in the matter has been concluded and the charge sheet has already been filed before the competent Court. In view thereof, it is argued that custodial interrogation of the applicant is no longer warranted. The learned Counsel also draws attention to the fact that the co-accused/ driver of the vehicle has already been enlarged on bail, and therefore, on the principle of parity, the applicant is similarly entitled to be released on bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned APP representing the

respondent/ State, has opposed the present bail application and submits that there exists a long-standing property dispute between the family of the applicant and that of the deceased, which provides a motive for the commission of the offence. The learned APP submits that on the date of the incident, the applicant is alleged to have followed the deceased in his car and deliberately knocked him off his motorcycle, thereby causing him to fall. It is further alleged that the applicant, in collusion with the co-accused, thereafter alighted from the vehicle and assaulted the deceased with an iron rod. The informant, who is the father of the deceased, is an eyewitness to the entire sequence of events. The prosecution further relies upon the recovery of an iron rod at the instance of the applicant, which is claimed to be the weapon used in the commission of the offence. Additionally, the CCTV footage has been obtained which shows the applicant taking his car for repairs shortly after the incident, thereby corroborating the prosecution's case.

4. The learned APP also points out that the applicant had previously preferred a bail application before the Sessions Court, which was rejected vide order dated 23 October 2024. It is submitted that the nature of the offence is grave

and serious, and that enlargement of the applicant on bail at this stage would seriously impede the administration of justice.

5. Upon meticulous perusal of the records, and the material placed on record, it *prima facie* appears that the applicant is involved in a serious and brutal assault upon the deceased, which ultimately resulted in the latter's death. The CCTV footage indicating that the applicant took his vehicle for repairs lends credence to the prosecution's version of events. The post-mortem report reveals that head injury is one of the probable causes of death, which is consistent with the nature of the assault alleged by the prosecution. Furthermore, the recovery of an iron rod at the instance of the applicant, coupled with the identification of the applicant by the eyewitness, strengthens the prosecution's case.

6. In view of the gravity of the offence, the existence of direct evidence implicating the applicant, and the potential impact on the course of justice, this Court is not inclined to exercise discretion in favour of the applicant. Accordingly, the present bail application stands rejected.

[R. N. Laddha, J.]