



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

BAIL APPLICATION NO.237 OF 2026

Nandu Bhaginath Borse

... APPLICANT

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra

... RESPONDENT

.....
Mr. S.G. Bobde, Advocate for applicant
Mr. A.R. Kale, A.P.P. for respondent – State
.....

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 20th FEBRUARY, 2026

PER COURT :

1. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the State.
2. This is a successive bail application filed by the applicant. The learned A.P.P. has opposed the application, this being successive Bail Application. There is no disclosure of the same, nor the copy of order rejecting earlier application is enclosed.
3. It is a well-established 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.

4. When confronted with the learned counsel for the applicant to demonstrate any such new grounds or change in circumstances, failed to provide any fresh material or valid justification that would warrant a reconsideration of the earlier decision.

5. In the absence of any demonstrable change in the case, and failure to demonstrate earlier rejection of bail application by this Court, the application lacks merit and does not warrant further consideration.

6. So far as the plea of delay in trial cannot be considered in isolation, considering the severity of the offence and the potential punishment, same also does not warrant consideration, as has been held by the Apex Court in case of **State of Bihar Vs. Amit Kumar (2017) 13 SCC 751**.

7. In the light of the above, the application does not deserve consideration, accordingly, the same is rejected.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)

fmp/-