



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 555 OF 2026

Baliram @ Balram Karansingh Chavhan,
Age 25 years, Occ. Labour,
R/o. Samtanagar, Dist.Jalgaon ... Applicant

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent.

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Nilesh S. Ghanekar and Shri. Dhanraj S. Ingole
Addl.PP. for Respondent/State : Mr. A.R. Kale

CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.

DATE : 23.04.2026

PER COURT :

Heard both sides.

2. The applicant is seeking regular bail in connection with Crime No. 392/2023, registered with Ramanand Nagar Police Station, District Jalgaon for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 307, 201 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The applicant is arrested on 13.12.2023. The charge-sheet is filed on 07.03.2024. The trial has not been commenced so far.

4. Report is lodged by brother of the deceased Arun that there was rivalry in Baba group led by co-accused Sonu Adhale and the group of the informant and the victims in Samtanagar Jalgaon. It is alleged that on 10.12.2023 deceased Arun and Ashish Sonawne were called to Wanjaritekadi to settle the dispute. The applicant and the co-accused were present and armed with the weapon. They attacked Ashish, who was

rescued, but they caught hold of deceased Arun, who was assaulted by sharp weapons. Informant was also assaulted. Other people gathered and Arun was shifted to hospital but he could not survive.

5. Learned counsel Mr. Ghanekar for the applicant submits that the applicant is entitled to bail on the ground of parity, considering the orders passed by the High Court in the matters of co-accused Ashok and Dodhya. The motive was attributable to co-accused Dodhya, still he was enlarged on bail. No specific role is attributed to the applicant. There is only one antecedent against him. The recovery of weapon at his instance cannot be *per se* inculpatory. My attention is adverted to the statements recorded during the course of investigation.

6. Learned Addl.PP Mr. Kale vehemently repeals the submissions contending that there are as many as six eye witnesses, who are consistent in indicating brutal attack on the deceased. A specific role is attributed to applicant for having caused injuries by knife. The recovery of weapon at his instance is corroborative. It is vehemently pointed out that the role attributed to Ashok and Dodhya are different. The statement of Ashish was not pointed out to the earlier bench. My attention is adverted to postmortem report to show 24 injuries. The M.L.C report of Ashish corroborates the prosecution theory.

6. Informant is injured eye witness. There are other five witnesses whose statements indicate presence of the applicant and his role of inflicting blows by knife. The statement of Ashish discloses first attack made by Ashok, followed by attack on Arun. He is also attacked immediately by co-accused including the present applicant. Thereafter co-accused assaulted deceased Arun. Postmortem report indicates 24 injuries in column 17, which are said to be caused by sharp weapons. The medical certificate of Ashish also indicates corresponding injuries.

7. Despite above facts, co-accused Pravin @ Dodhya was enlarged on

bail vide order dated 21.08.2025. The motive can be more attributed to Dodhya, because wife of deceased Arun was his niece and marriage was not being approved by him. Another co-accused Ashok was granted bail vide order dated 10.10.2025. Neither of the orders are challenged before the Apex Court. The role attributed to co-accused Dodhya and Ashok are identical in nature to that of the applicant. There was no recovery at the instance of Ashok or Dodhya, is one of the reason for granting them bail. I find that the applicant is entitled to have benefit of parity. The recovery of knife at his instance cannot be inculpatory *per se*. Its implication can be examined during the course of trial.

8. There is possibility of having common intention but the co-accused are released on bail. The trial is not likely to be concluded because it has not been commenced yet. I hold that the applicant is also entitled to bail.

9. The Bail Application is allowed.

10. The applicant **Baliram @ Balram Karansingh Chavan** shall be released on bail in connection with Crime No. 392/2023, registered with Ramanand Nagar Police Station, District Jalgaon for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 307, 201 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code on following conditions:

(a) The applicant shall furnish P.R. bond of Rs. 70,000/- (Rs. Seventy Thousand only) with one or more solvent surety of like amount.

(b) The applicant shall not tamper with prosecution evidence or contact with the prosecution witnesses.

(c) The applicant shall furnish his mobile/cell number and address to the investigating officer.

(d) The applicant shall not enter Jalgaon till

conclusion of the trial, save and except for attending the trial.

(e) The applicant shall cooperate for expeditious disposal of the trial.

(f) The applicant shall surrender his Aadhar Card and PAN card to the investigating officer.

11. Bail application is disposed of.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)

mkd/-