



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

964 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 212 OF 2026

Rushikesh Alias Tamya Vasant PawarApplicant

VERSUS

The State of MaharashtraRespondent

Ms. P. S. Magre, Advocate for Applicant.

Mr. A. R. Kale, Addl. GP for the State.

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 24th FEBRUARY, 2026.

PER COURT :

1. This is a successive bail application
2. It is well settled legal principle that a subsequent bail plea must be predicated on a substantial change in circumstances or the emergence of new material facts after the rejection of the previous application.
3. When confronted, the learned Counsel for the Applicant to demonstrate any such new grounds or change in circumstances, could not demonstrate any fresh material or valid justification that would warrant a reconsideration of the earlier decision.
4. Further, perusal of the application does not indicate details of criminal antecedents against the Applicant.

5. The Hon'ble Apex Court, in the case of **Munnesh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh** (2025 SCC OnLine SC 1374) and in the case of, **Zeba Khan vs. State of UP and others** (Criminal Appeal No. 825/2026), has made it obligatory for the applicants to disclose comprehensive details regarding their criminal antecedents. This mandate includes a specific obligation to provide particulars for each antecedent mentioned. In the present case, the Applicant has committed a serious departure from these requirements by failing to provide such details. This non-disclosure constitutes a suppression of material facts, which disentitles the Applicant from seeking the requested reliefs.

6. In the absence of any demonstrable change in circumstances in the facts on the legal position of the case and for want of disclosure of criminal antecedents against the Applicant, further consideration of the application is not warranted.

7. As such, the application stands rejected.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)

dyb