



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

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2483 OF 2025

ROHIT SATPAL KAUDA
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Neb Yogesh Rajendra,
(Appointed through Legal Aid)
APP for Respondent : Ms. P. V. Diggikar
...

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 12-01-2026

PER COURT:-

1. The applicant seeks regular bail in connection with Crime No.0191 of 2024 dated 07.05.2024 registered with Bhagyanagar Police Station, District Nanded, for the offences punishable under Sections 394, 397 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/25, 5/25 and 27(2) of the Arms Act, 1959.
2. The prosecution case is that on 07.05.2024 at about 3:00 p.m., the informant, Ravindra, withdrew ₹40,000/- cash from the State Bank of India, Taroda Branch, and returned to his house, where two unknown individuals arrived on a Scooty and demanded cash from him. When Ravindra refused, the person wearing a pink shirt fired a gun in his direction, causing bleeding injuries to the informant's left wrist and right toe. The second person, wearing a black shirt and armed with dagger, then snatched the ₹40,000/- cash and the informant's mobile phone. Both assailants fled the scene. A police report was subsequently lodged.

3. During the investigation, accused Hardeepsingh was arrested and CCTV footage was examined. He confessed to the police that he had provided his vehicle and given inputs to the co-accused, Rohit/applicant and Sarpreetsing, enabling them to commit the alleged offence. Eventually, the police recovered the ₹40,000/- cash, the vehicles used in the crime, and the knife. The firearm used in the incident had previously been recovered from the spot of the offence.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has not committed the alleged offence and has been falsely implicated in the crime. The counsel pointed that the applicant has been incarcerated for more than one year and seven months. As the investigation is complete, further detention of the applicant is unwarranted, especially given that the prosecution needs to examine 21 witnesses and the trial will take time to conclude. The applicant reportedly traveled with accused No. 3 for darshan at the Gurudwara and has no connection with accused No. 1, who is merely a friend of accused No. 3. Hence, prayed to allow the application.

5. The learned A.P.P. has opposed the application and submitted that the offence is of serious in nature. There is sufficient material on record to establish the complicity of the applicant in the alleged offence. If the applicant is enlarged on

bail, there is every possibility of tampering with the prosecution evidence. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

6. Having heard the submissions from both the sides and upon considering the material on record indicates that the investigating agency has recovered the alleged weapon used in the crime at the instance of the present applicant. The CCTV footage of the incident has also been obtained by the investigating agency, and the medical report corroborates the allegations made in the FIR.

7. *Prima facie*, the applicant, along with the co-accused, shared a common intent and played an active role in the alleged crime. Considering the gravity and the serious nature of the offence, this court is not inclined to allow this application.

8. Resultantly, the bail application is rejected.

9. The Secretary, High Court Legal Services Sub-Committee, Aurangabad to pay the fees of the appointed counsel for the applicant as per schedule.

[SACHIN S. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE

rrd