



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 885 OF 2025

TEJASING NARSINGH BAWRI
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. A. R. Syed
APP for Respondents-State : Mr. P. P. Dawalkar
...

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.
Date : 6th January, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. The applicant has approached this Court seeking regular bail in connection with FIR dated 29.07.2023 bearing Crime No. 335 of 2023 registered with Kadim Jalna Police Station, Dist. Jalna for the offences punishable under Sections 302 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned APP for the State.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that this a successive bail application and the earlier application has been rejected by this Court. When confronted about the change in circumstance, the learned counsel for application could not

demonstrate the same.

4. Although this is a successive bail application, there is no statement in the application disclosing the details of rejection of earlier bail application nor the copy of the same is placed on record.

5. Upon perusal of the material on record including the charge-sheet indicates that there are certain criminal cases pending against the applicant. As such, the applicant has criminal antecedents. Furthermore, non-disclosure of the prior order of this Court regarding rejection of the bail application amounts to material suppression of fact.

6. It was obligatory to disclose the details and orders of previous bail applications, while presenting a successive bail application and the same is not complied with.

7. The Hon'ble Apex Court in case of **Kalyan Chandra Sarkar and Ors. Vs. Rajesh Ranjan and Ors. [(2004)7 SCC 528]** has observed as under :

12. In regard to cases where earlier bail applications have been rejected there is a further onus on the court to consider the subsequent application for grant of bail by noticing the grounds on which earlier

bail applications have been rejected and after such consideration if the court is of the opinion that bail has to be granted then said court will have to give specific reasons why in spite of such earlier rejection the subsequent application for bail should be granted."

8. In the aforesaid backdrop, the applicant has failed to point out any fresh grounds for presenting this successive bail application and the existing grounds have already been addressed. As such, I am not inclined to exercise discretion in favor of the applicant.

9. In that view of the matter, the bail application being devoid of merits, is **rejected**.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)

Omkar Joshi