



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

BAIL APPLICATION NO.2224 OF 2025

Ritesh @ Vicky s/o Bhagwat Puse

... APPLICANT

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & anr.

... RESPONDENTS

.....
Mr. D.S. Kale, Advocate for applicant

Mr. C.V. Bhadane, A.P.P. for respondents
.....

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 20th FEBRUARY, 2026

PER COURT :

1. The applicant seeks release on regular bail in connection with Crime No.220/2025, registered with City Chowk Police Station, District Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 118(1), 189(2), 190, 191(2), 191(3), 352 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita.

2. The prosecution case is that, on 6/6/2025 at 10.30 Hrs., when the informant along with his friends was in a ground in front of

Mahadeo Temple, Khadkeshwar, the present applicant made phone call to Sagar and as the said mobile phone was possessed by the complainant when received the call and asked as to who was speaking. The applicant responded that, he is Vicky Puse and where is Sagar, hand over phone to him, and saying so, started abusing. When the complainant gave phone to Sagar, a dispute started between them on account of money transaction and even they were abusing each other.

3. Thereafter at about 3.30 to 4.00 p.m., the present applicant along with other accused persons reached there on motorcycles and there dispute started between the applicant and Sagar. The applicant slapped Sagar. When the complainant and others went to rescue Sagar, the applicant took out a knife gave knife blows on the stomach and right side of chest of Sagar with intention to kill. While the complainant and others were rescuing Sagar, the applicant gave blow after blow of knife on the left hand arm and chest of Gaurav Rajgure and also gave two blows of knife on the left hand arm of Arjun Gungase. The friend of the applicant namely Rahul Mane hit an iron bar in the head of the complainant as also Gangya Aditya Changle and other two unknown persons assaulted them by chain, iron rod.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that, it is a case of over implication. The injured are already discharged from hospital. The investigation is complete for all intents and purpose. The trial will take its own time. As such, further incarceration of the applicant would be unjustified. Therefore, prayed to allow the application.

5. Per contra, learned A.P.P. vehemently opposed the application, submitting that the complicity of the applicant in the offence is apparent. There are eye witnesses. The injured persons have sustained grievous injuries and there is possibility of applicant tampering or influencing the witnesses.

6. Upon considering the submissions advanced by learned counsel for both sides and perusal of the material on record, prima facie, it appears that, it is a case of over-implication. The injured persons are discharged from the hospital. The applicant is young and is in custody since 8 months from the date of his arrest i.e. 7/6/2025. Furthermore, the alleged altercation appears to have taken place at the spur of moment. Moreover, the requisite statements and medical report are obtained by the investigating agency. Since the recovery is carried out, no purpose would be

served by keeping the applicant behind the bars indefinitely.

7. Nevertheless, the investigation is complete for all intents and purpose. The charge sheet is filed. Further detention of the applicant may amount to pretrial detention, which is unwarranted. In that view of the matter, case is made out for exercise of discretion in favour of the applicant. The apprehension expressed by learned A.P.P. can be adequately taken care of by imposing stringent conditions upon the applicant.

8. Hence the order :

ORDER

- (i) Bail Application is allowed.
- (ii) The applicant Ritesh @ Vicky s/o Bhagwat Puse be released on bail on furnishing P.B. and S.B. of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) with one solvent surety of the like amount in the above crime, on the conditions that :
 - (a) The applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution witnesses in any way.
 - (b) The applicant shall remain present on each date, unless exempted by the trial Court.
- (iii) Needless to state that, the observations rendered herein

are confined to the present application, and the trial Court shall decide the trial on its own merits and in accordance with law.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)

fmp/-