

sg

37.ba3740-25.docx

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

Bail Application No.3740 of 2025

Jeevan Gangaram Kamble
(Presently Lodged at Yerwada Central Jail)
Age: 31 Years, Occupation: Nil,
R/at - Uttamnagar, Mantarwadi Chowk,
Saswad Road, Hadapsar,
Pune.

... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
Through: Hadapsar Police Station,
In CR No.900 of 2020

... Respondent

Mr Nagesh Khedkar, for the applicant.
Mr MG Patil, APP, for the respondent/ State.

**Coram: R.N. Laddha, J.
Date: 30 September 2025.**

P.C.:

Heard Mr Nagesh Khedkar, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant; and Mr MG Patil, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent/State.

2. The present application has been preferred by the applicant seeking enlargement on bail in connection with Crime No. 900 of 2022 registered with Hadapsar Police Station, Pune, for offences punishable under Sections 302, 120B, 143, 147,

149, and 212 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860; Section 4 read with Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959; and Section 37(1) read with Section 135 of the Maharashtra Police Act, 1951.

3. Learned Counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the applicant has been incarcerated since 27th May 2020, and has remained in judicial custody for a considerable period. It is contended that certain co-accused persons have already been granted bail by this Court, and therefore, the applicant seeks similar relief on the ground of parity.

4. It is further submitted that the applicant's earlier bail application was rejected by this Court vide order dated 20th August 2024. However, in view of the subsequent grant of bail to one of the co-accused by this Court on 3rd July 2025, the applicant has preferred the present application seeking reconsideration.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State opposes the application, contending that the offences alleged are of a grave and heinous nature, carrying the punishment of death or life imprisonment. It is submitted that the weapons used in the commission of the offence were recovered at the instance of the applicant. The applicant is alleged to be the principal accused,

with a specific and active role attributed to him in the commission of the crime. The post-mortem report reveals as many as thirty-two grievous injuries on the body of the deceased, predominantly chop and incised wounds. The applicant is stated to have four prior criminal antecedents of a similar nature. It is further argued that the co-accused who has been granted bail is not similarly situated, and therefore, the principle of parity cannot be invoked in favour of the present applicant.

6. Upon perusal of the charge-sheet and consideration of the submissions advanced by both sides, this Court finds that there exists prima facie material indicating the applicant's motive and active involvement in the commission of the offence. The recovery of weapons at the instance of the applicant, coupled with the nature and extent of injuries sustained by the deceased, fortifies the prosecution's case. The co-accused who has been granted bail does not stand on equal footing with the present applicant, and hence, the plea of parity is untenable. The applicant's criminal antecedents further aggravate the apprehension of repetition of similar offences.

7. In view of the gravity of the offence, the applicant's antecedents, and the material available on record, this Court is

of the considered opinion that the applicant does not deserve the indulgence of bail. The possibility of the applicant committing similar offences upon release cannot be ruled out.

8. Accordingly, the present bail application stands rejected.

(R.N. Laddha, J.)