

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

**INTERIM APPLICATION NO.2571 OF 2025
IN
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.726 OF 2025**

Satish Sharad IngavaleApplicant
Versus
The State of Maharashtra Respondent

Mr. Shailesh Chavan, Advocate a/w. Milind Deshmukh for
the Appellant.

Ms. R.D. Humane, APP for the Respondent-State.

CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.

DATE : 21st JULY, 2025

P.C. :

1. This is an Application for bail pending Appeal.
The Applicant was convicted and sentenced by the
Additional Sessions Judge, Malshiras vide his judgment and
order dated 17.6.2025, as under :

- i. The Applicant was convicted for the offence punishable
under Section 332 of IPC and was sentenced to suffer
SI for two years and to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/- and in
default to suffer SI for two months.

- ii. He was convicted for commission of the offence punishable under Section 186 of IPC and sentenced to suffer SI for two months and to pay a fine of Rs.500/- and in default to suffer SI for ten days.
- iii. He was further convicted for commission of the offence punishable under Section 504 of IPC and sentenced to suffer SI for six months and to pay a fine of Rs.1000/- and in default to suffer SI for two months.
- iv. He was also convicted for commission of the offence punishable under Section 352 of IPC and sentenced to suffer SI for one month and to pay a fine of Rs.500/- and in default to suffer SI for ten days.

The Applicant was acquitted from the charges of commission of offence punishable under Sections 353 and 506 of IPC. All the sentences were directed to run concurrently.

2. Heard Mr. Shailesh Chavan, learned counsel for the Appellant and Ms. R.D. Humane, learned APP for the Respondent-State.

3. The prosecution case is that the informant was working as Assistant Engineer in MSEDCL at Divisional Office at Akuj in 2014. On 22.12.2014 at about 2.30 p.m. the Applicant came to his house and enquired with him as to what had happened about old water supply depot at Natepute. The informant told him that he was planning to sign the proposal within two to three days. The Applicant got angry and slapped the informant two times. The Applicant abused him. The others separated the quarrel. The Applicant left the office. The informant lodged his FIR vide C.R. No.244/2014 at Akuj. The investigation was carried out. During the trial, the prosecution examined six witnesses. At the end of the trial, the Applicant was convicted and sentenced as mentioned earlier.

4. Learned counsel for the Applicant submitted that the Applicant was suffering from heart ailment and has

already undergone bypass surgery. He was on bail during the trial. He has no antecedents. Even after his conviction he was granted bail under Section 430 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita.

5. Learned APP opposed these submissions. She submitted that there are witnesses to the incident. The Applicant had slapped a public servant who was doing his duty.

6. I have considered these submissions. Though at this stage there is material against the Applicant, however, the maximum sentence imposed on him is only two years. The Appeal is not likely to be decided during that period. The Applicant was on bail during pendency of the trial. He has not misused that liberty. There are no antecedents against him. Even after conviction he was granted bail under Section 430 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, for a limited period. Considering this situation, I am inclined to grant bail to the Applicant, during pendency of his Appeal in this Court.

7. Hence, the following order :

ORDER

- (i) During pendency and final disposal of the Criminal Appeal No.726/2025, the Applicant is directed to be released on bail on his executing a P.R. bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) with one or two sureties in the like amount.
- (ii) Interim Application is disposed of accordingly.

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)