



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

**BAIL APPLICATION NO. 325 OF 2026**

**PRAMOD ALIAS PRADIP DIPCHAND VISHWAKARMA  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA**

...  
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Shete Shankar Govindrao  
APP for Respondent : Mr. A.R. Kale

...  
**CORAM : RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.  
DATE : 18<sup>TH</sup> MARCH, 2026**

**PER COURT :**

1. The sole accused has preferred an application for grant of bail in connection with Crime No. 609/2024, registered with Kotwali Police Station, District Ahmednagar, for the offence punishable under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. In short, it is the case of the prosecution that the reporter by name Vishwas Dange stated that in agricultural field, several rooms were constructed, in which, the labourers used to reside. In one of the rooms, the present applicant was residing. On 21.05.2024, at about 11:48 p.m., he received a telephonic call from one Parmatmaram Sudarshanram, who informed that the applicant had assaulted one Ashokkumar on his head by means of stone due to which, Ashokkumar had fallen and the blood was oozing from his ear. The informant then immediately reached to the spot,

approached the concerned police station. He has also called the private ambulance.

3. At this juncture, learned counsel Mr. Shete, has contended that the manner in which the incident has taken place and the weapon of offence used, if seen would reveal that, *prima facie*, case is not made out against the applicant. He submitted that there is no description of the weapon of crime and, therefore, it is very difficult to arrive at the conclusion as to whether the injuries sustained were outcome of the weapon used. He further contended that since chargesheet is already filed and applicant has no criminal antecedents, he be enlarged on bail.

4. Per Contra, learned APP contended that there is an eye witness to the incident and the injuries if seen would clearly reveal that there was intention to commit an offence. He submitted that the final report clearly makes out a case against the applicant and therefore, prayed for rejection of bail.

5. With the assistance of both the learned counsels, I have gone through the record of the case which is annexed along with the bail application. Incident had occurred on 21 May 2014 at about 11:48 in the night. Eye witness Parmatmaram Sudarshan, whose statement was

recorded on 23.05.2024, had category stated that he along with his friend had been to the hotel for enjoying the food, at which time, the present applicant came near his table and all of them were enjoying the food. Since for returning home, there was no vehicle for the applicant, deceased / Ashokkumar was called by the present applicant. Ashokkumar then came to the spot of the incident, and at that time, altercation was going on between the applicant and said Ashokkumar. Ashokkumar was sitting on his motorcycle and Pramod @ Pradip / the present applicant was standing in front of him. Thereafter, when quarrel continued, said Parmatmaram tried to intervene and he came back to his room.

6. Again Paramatmaram, heard the quarrel going on between the Ashokkumar and the present applicant and he came out of the house, where he noticed that Ashokkumar was lying in the pool of blood and the applicant was holding the piece of stone Slab (Farshi) and again assaulted Ashokkumar on his head by means of said stone. When Parmatmaram tried to intervene, the applicant also threatened him to kill.

7. Thereafter, the present applicant dropped the weapon on the spot of the incident, returned to room and, thereafter, went away along with the bag of clothes. As as said Ashokkumar had died on 22.05.2022, the postmortem report was conducted on his body. Cause of death in

postmortem report is head injury due to physical assault. The injuries sustained are mentioned in column no. 17 of the post mortem report. Column no. 18 further shows multiple depressed fracture of whole skull bone. Thus, it is evident that several blows were given on the vital part of the body. At this stage, commenting something on merit would not be proper. Considering the fact that the applicant is under the prosecution.

8. Suffice it to say that the eye witness to the incident i.e. Parmatmaram, *prima facie*, inspires the confidence. Since, *prima facie*, material is available against the applicant, I am not inclined to allow the present application. Hence, the following order is passed :

**ORDER**

- i. Bail Application is rejected.
- ii. At this stage, it is necessary to mention here that Mr. Govindrao Shete, has argued the matter with full preparation. His fees be quantified as per the rules.

( RAJNISH R. VYAS, J. )