



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

27 BAIL APPLICATION NO. 663 OF 2026

PANDIT KONDIBA RAVANKULE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

...
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Bhagwat Rameshwar Maroti.
APP for Respondent/s-State : Mr. G. O. Wattamwar.

...

CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.
DATE : 05.05.2026

PER COURT :-

1. Heard both sides.
2. The applicant is seeking bail in respect of offence bearing Crime No.187 of 2025, registered with Renapur Police Station, District Latur, for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 309(4), 331(3), 331(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
3. It is reported to the police by nephew of the deceased person that deceased Pushpalata and Raosaheb were residing together in Gut No.530 at village Garsuli, Taluka Renapur, District Latur. Raosaheb is stated to be paralytic and Pushpalata was looking after the agricultural operations. Both of them were found to be dead on 27.05.2025. Pushpalata was

seen injured in a room whereas dead body of Raosaheb was found in the well. It is further reported that unidentified person for committing theft might have assaulted the couple. The blood stained cooker was found in the room. The mobile handset of the deceased was also found to be missing.

4. On the basis of secret information, the applicant was taken into confidence and he disclosed commission of offence.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that there is no incriminating material to connect the applicant to the crime. The confession which is mentioned in memorandum panchanama is an inadmissible. The recovery of clothes, articles and the mobile is vulnerable. There is no identification of the golden ornaments recovered at the instance of the applicant. The possibility of commission of murder due to the disputes of the deceased with other persons cannot be ruled out. The grounds of arrest have not been supplied to the applicant.

6. Per contra, learned APP would submit that the involvement of the applicant surfaced due to the reliable information. The memorandum panchnama and recovery in furtherance thereof would corroborate the prosecution theory. The Post Mortem Report of Pushpalata would indicate cause of

death due to head injury and blood smeared cooker was found near the dead body. My attention is adverted to the statement of Arun to disclose that applicant was involved in similar type of offences previously and he was being taunted by Pushpalata which can be the cause of action to eliminate her. There is no reason to falsely implicate the applicant in the offence.

7. First Information Report is lodged against unidentified person. Pushpalata was found dead in a room and a cooker was found with blood stains. Raosaheb was found dead in the well. Applicant is also from the same village. There is reason to believe that applicant was known to the deceased persons.

8. I have gone through memorandum panchnama prepared under Section 23 of the B.N.S. Act. The incriminating statements recorded therein have no probative value. The recovery in pursuance of the panchnama can at the most be said to be relevant. The golden beads and blood smeared shirt were recovered from house of the applicant and the mobile was recovered from the well. At this stage of the proceeding, the recovery at the instance of the applicant cannot be said to be inculpatory.

9. The gold beads and golden pendent of the Mangalsutra have not been identified by anybody. There is no investigation

conducted to connect the applicant for the theft of the articles belonging to the deceased couple. It would be matter of trial to examine this aspect of the matter. The case is based upon circumstantial evidence. Therefore, heavy burden would be placed on the prosecution to supply the missing link so as to prove beyond reasonable doubt the involvement of the applicant.

10. I have considered the statements of Hanmant, Arun and Chandrakant which would indicate that the deceased had disputes with their nephews and the couple was staying alone at the village. The statement of Arun would indicate that deceased Pushpalata used to taunt applicant as a dacoit. However, this aspect of the matter can better be dealt with during the course of trial. The false implication due to animus of the deceased Pushpalata against the applicant also cannot be ruled out.

11. Only one criminal antecedent is reported against the applicant. He is behind bar since 28.05.2025. Investigation is over. I am inclined to grant bail to the applicant. I, therefore, pass the following order :

ORDER

- (i) Bail Application is allowed.

(ii) Applicant **PANDIT KONDIBA RAVANKULE** shall be released on bail in Crime No.187 of 2025, registered with Renapur Police Station, District Latur, for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 309(4), 331(3), 331(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, on furnishing P. R. bond of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees fifty thousands only) with one solvent surety of like amount on the following conditions :

- (a) The applicant shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or contact with the prosecution witnesses.
- (b) The applicant shall stay away from village Garsuli, Taluka Renapur till conclusion of the trial.
- (c) The applicant shall furnish his whereabouts and contact numbers to the Investigating Officer.
- (d) The applicant shall submit his Aadhar Card and PAN Card to the Investigating Officer, if any.

- (e) The applicant shall co-operate for expeditious disposal of the trial and attend the dates punctually.
- (iii) Bail application is disposed of accordingly.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)

...

vmk/-