IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.2352 OF 2025

Ashok Dattatray Kulkarni … Applicant
Vs.
State of Maharashtra … Respondent

Mr. Rajiv Patil, Senior Advocate a/w. Mr. Vishal Kolekar and Mr. Shubham Kadam for Applicant.
Mr. Prashant Jadhav, APP for Respondent-State.

CORAM : MANISH PITALE, J.
DATE : OCTOBER 06, 2025

P.C. :

. Heard Mr. Rajiv Patil, learned senior counsel appearing for the applicant and Mr. Prashant Jadhav, learned APP appearing for the respondent-State.

2. This is a second anticipatory bail application filed by this very applicant. The earlier application bearing Anticipatory Bail Application No.2474 of 2024 was rejected by an order dated 20.09.2024. The contentions raised on behalf of this applicant were considered on their own merits and thereupon, the application was dismissed.

3. The charge-sheet, in the present case, was filed on 31.01.2025. It appears that thereafter, the applicant filed second anticipatory bail application before the Sessions Court. The same was dismissed on 18.06.2025. The Sessions Court recorded the fact that the earlier anticipatory bail applications filed before that Court and this Court had been rejected and that, there was no change in circumstance, justifying filing of the second anticipatory bail application before the Sessions Court.

MINAL SANDIP PARAB
Digitally signed by MINAL SANDIP PARAB
Date: 2025.10.06 18:03:09 +0530

4. This Court is of the opinion that merely because charge-sheet has

been filed, cannot be a ground for entertaining this second anticipatory bail application before this Court. An attempt was made on behalf of the applicant to refer to certain documents on record, to claim that ingredients of the offences registered against the applicant along with co-accused persons, are not made out. These aspects were indeed considered by this Court while rejecting the earlier anticipatory bail application filed by the applicant.

5. The learned APP informs that out of total 24 accused persons, only 2 could be arrested and 22 accused persons, including the applicant herein, are still on the run.

6. In such a situation, this Court is not inclined to entertain the instant second anticipatory bail application filed before this Court.

7. Accordingly, the application is dismissed.

(MANISH PITALE, J.)

Minal Parab