

AGK

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
BAIL APPLICATION NO.446 OF 2025**

Indrajeet Ramkhelawan Patel ... Applicant
V/s.
 The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent
 Mr. Datta Solankar for the applicant.
 Mr. C.D. Mali, APP for the respondent-State.

CORAM : AMIT BORKAR, J.

DATED : SEPTEMBER 29, 2025

P.C.:

ATUL
GANESH
KULKARNI

Digitally signed
by ATUL GANESH
KULKARNI
Date: 2025.09.29
15:26:38 +0530

1. By this application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ("BNSS"), the applicant seeks regular bail in connection with Crime Register No.53 of 2022 registered at Mahad MIDC Police Station for offences punishable under Sections 302, 352, 323, 504, 506 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ("IPC").
2. The prosecution case is that the informant was employed as a driver with Pranay Logistics from 1 May 2022 and was working with tanker No.MH-43-BG-3381. With him, one Sandeepkumar Bind was working as a cleaner. Another tanker No.MH-43-BG-4081 was being driven by Ram Asare Dayal, who was accompanied by his distant nephew Saurabh Bind as cleaner. On 2 May 2022, both the tankers were taken to New India Detergent Pvt. Ltd., Mahad MIDC for filling chemical. One of the tankers was not released due to leakage, and hence the drivers and cleaners were staying near the factory.

3. On 4 May 2022 at about 8.30 p.m., the informant, along with Sandeepkumar Bind, Ram Dayal, and Saurabh Bind, was sitting on tanker No.MH-43-BG-3381. At that time, tanker No.MH-05-AM-0716 arrived. Its driver got down, and a quarrel took place between him and Saurabh. Initially, the quarrel was pacified with the intervention of other drivers and the company watchman.
4. However, around 10.00 p.m., when Saurabh returned from the company premises with bottles of water, the driver of tanker No.MH-05-AM-0716 suddenly attacked him with a knife on his neck while also holding a wheel wrench. The injury caused was grievous, and blood started flowing from Saurabh's neck. Witnesses state that the driver loudly shouted that his name was Indrajit and that he would kill Saurabh. The witnesses further stated that the applicant continued to beat Saurabh, who collapsed due to the injuries. Though the informant and others tried to catch the assailant, he escaped taking advantage of the darkness. The victim was taken to hospital but was declared dead. The assailant was identified as the present applicant, Indrajit Ramkhelavan Patel.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant argued that the applicant has been falsely implicated. He pointed out that there is no sufficient material to connect the applicant with the offence. It is submitted that the applicant has been in custody since 5 May 2022 and that the trial is not likely to commence soon as there are 36 witnesses cited by the prosecution.
6. The learned APP, however, opposed the application. He

submitted that the statements of eyewitnesses clearly attribute the role of the applicant in directly causing the fatal injury to the deceased by using a knife on his neck. The injury is of such a nature that it was sufficient to cause death in the ordinary course. It was also pointed out that the statement under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure lends support to the prosecution version. Hence, considering the gravity of the offence, bail cannot be granted.

7. On examining the record, it is clear that the incident took place in the presence of eyewitnesses who have specifically named the applicant. The role attributed to him is of inflicting a knife blow on the vital part of the body of the deceased. The medical evidence indicates that the injury was fatal. The statement of witnesses recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. also supports the case of the prosecution. The plea of false implication, at this stage, cannot be accepted in face of consistent eyewitness account.

8. The contention of delay in trial cannot outweigh the seriousness of the offence. The applicant is accused of committing murder by inflicting a direct blow with a deadly weapon on a vital part of the body. In such circumstances, the judicial discretion to release on bail cannot be exercised in his favour.

9. Accordingly, the bail application does not merit acceptance.

10. The application stands rejected.

(AMIT BORKAR, J.)