IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

29 BAIL APPLICATION NO.1626 OF 2026

Rahul Ramakant Parshetti
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra
.....
Shri. Ganesh J. Kore, Advocate for Applicant
Smt. Ashlesha S. Deshmukh, APP for Respondent – State.
.....

CORAM : HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.
DATED : 02.11.2026

FINAL ORDER :

. Heard the learned Advocate for the Applicant and the learned APP for the State.

2. The learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that, the Application was initially preferred on medical grounds, for the reason that Applicant's mother requires urgent surgery for removal of an implant fitted in her elbow. By the previous order, this Court had called for a proper medical report along with the details of the expenses to be incurred and the date on which the surgery was proposed to be performed. Accordingly, the learned Advocate for the Applicant produced a medical certificate dated 15.10.2026, indicating that a period of 10 to 12 days would be required for post-operative recovery and that the estimated expenses for the surgery would be Rs.55,000/- to Rs.60,000/-. The learned Advocate for the Applicant, on instructions, has obtained a fresh medical certificate dated 27.10.2026 issued by Fadtale Hospital, wherein it is mentioned that the mother of the Applicant could be

admitted on 30.10.2026, the tentative date of surgery would be 02.11.2026 and the tentative date of discharge would be 10.11.2026.

3. Taking into consideration the aforesaid schedule of surgery, this Court adopted a humanitarian approach and expressed its inclination to release the Applicant on temporary bail to enable him to arrange finances for the surgery. This Court suggested that the Applicant could be released on temporary bail two days prior to the scheduled surgery, i.e. 02.11.2026, and for one day thereafter, and that upon expiry of the fourth day, the Applicant would surrender to custody. The learned Advocate for the Applicant sought time to obtain instructions and thereafter informed the Court that he was not pressing the application, as the Applicant was not willing to accept temporary bail for such a short duration. He submitted that, the Applicant may be released on bail from two days prior to the surgery until his mother's recovery is complete. This Court, however, clearly declined the said prayer. The learned Advocate for the Applicant thereafter submitted that he would press the application on merits. Accordingly, the matter is listed today for arguments on merits.

4. The learned Advocate for the Applicant submits that, the present application is a successive bail application and that Applicant’s first bail application came to be withdrawn on 07.04.2026. I have perused the order dated 07.04.2026. The said order contains reasons and specific observations regarding the role attributed to the present Applicant. The operative portion of the order records that the application stands

withdrawn after the Court had made observations concerning the Applicant's role. This Court, therefore, made an inquiry as to what change in circumstances had occurred after the order dated 07.04.2026, whereby the Applicant was permitted to withdraw his earlier bail application. The learned Advocate for the Applicant reiterates that, the only ground which ought to be considered as a change in circumstances is the illness of the Applicant's mother and the surgery requires to be performed upon her. The said ground cannot be considered as a change in circumstances warranting consideration of the successive bail application, particularly when the earlier bail application was withdrawn after this Court had expressed its disinclination to grant bail and had made specific observations concerning the role of the present Applicant.

5. In the absence of any fresh ground or change in circumstances being pointed out, the successive bail application cannot be entertained, and hence, the Application stands dismissed.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR)
JUDGE

GGP