

Nikita

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

**INTERIM APPLICATION NO.1095 OF 2025  
IN  
BAIL APPLICATION NO.5117 OF 2024**

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Pravin Kaluram Jadhav    | ... Applicant  |
| <b>V/s.</b>              |                |
| The State of Maharashtra | ... Respondent |

Ms. Sana Raees Khan, a/w Ms. Neha Balani for the Applicant.

Mr. A. A. Palkar, APP for the State.

Mr. Sanjay Devkule, PSI, Chikhali Police Station, Pune.

**CORAM : ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.**

**DATED : 11<sup>th</sup> JUNE, 2025**

**P.C.:**

1. Heard Ms. Sana Khan, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Mr. A. A. Palkar, learned APP for the State.
2. By order dated 14.12.2024, the Applicant was released on bail on the conditions mentioned in paragraph Nos. 14(a) to (h).
3. By the present application, the Applicant has sought for the following reliefs:

*“a. That this Hon’ble Court be pleased to relax the **clause b** of the Operative Part of the bail Order dated 14.12.2024 on such terms and conditions as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper;”*

4. Ms. Khan, learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that the Applicant has abided by all the conditions imposed on him in

the order dated 14.12.2024 and the Applicant is cooperating with the Investigation Officers. She submits that the parents of the Applicant are suffering from ailment and relies on the documents produced at Exhibit-C Colly and Exhibit-D Colly. She submits that the charge is yet not framed in the C.R. No.107 of 2023. She, by relying on the contents of the application submits that this is a fit case for relaxing the bail condition No.14(b).

2. Mr. A. A. Palkar, learned APP for the State, on instructions from the Investigation Officer, states that Applicant's entry in Pune District will result in serious problems to the witnesses in the case as also law and order situation, as such he opposes the present application. He submits that the offence involved in the crime are under IPC, as also the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, as such serious offence. He submits that the bail condition No. 14(b) was on the basis of the statement made by the Applicant, as recorded in paragraph No.10 of the order dated 14.12.2024. He submits that the Applicant having sought indulgence and being granted bail and the condition 14(b), being made on specific instruction of the Applicant, it is not open to the Applicant to seek relaxation of the said condition. He disputes the grounds on which the relaxation of the condition is sought for.

3. I have perused the record placed before me with the able assistance of the learned Advocates for both the sides.

4. Perusal of the order dated 14.12.2024 would indicate that the Applicant was granted bail by giving benefit of the delay in trial/no progress in the trial. Applicant's incarceration for a period

of one year and 10 months was considered as a ground for releasing the Applicant on bail. Paragraph Nos. 2 and 3 of the said order dated 14.12.2024 would indicate that the bail application was not decided on merits. Learned APP appears to be right in submitting that Paragraph No.10 of the order dated 14.12.2024 gives an impression that the bail condition No.14(b) was invited and was imposed at the instance of the Applicant.

5. Considering the nature of the crime and the offences charged against the Applicant and for the apprehension expressed by the Investigation Officer in the context of the relaxation of the condition No.14(b), no case is made out to entertain the application.

6. The Interim Application No.1095 of 2025 is, therefore, dismissed.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE. J.)