

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR**

**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3712 OF 2025  
IN  
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 785 OF 2017**

Ramgounda Shivgounda Amrutatti ...Applicant

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra ...Respondent

.....

Mr. Rahul P. Sagar a/w. Mr. Anush Shethy (through VC) i/b. R. Yug Mohit Choudhary, Advocate for applicant.

Mr. Shivam Choudhari, APP for the respondent-State.

.....

**CORAM : R.G. AVACHAT AND  
AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, JJ.**

**DATE : 5<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY, 2026.**

**P.C:**

1. Heard.
2. This is an application for suspension of the substantive sentence of imprisonment for life imposed upon the applicant by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangli, in Sessions Case No.

22 of 2014 for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The applicant has been convicted for the murder of one Suresh. It is the case of the prosecution that there existed a dispute between the applicant and the deceased on account of the alleged emotional relationship between the deceased and the applicant's wife. Witnesses have been examined in that regard and the case is based on circumstantial evidence. It is further submitted that the applicant has been behind bars for a period of little over ten years. The applicant had earlier preferred a similar application, which came to be rejected when he had undergone about six years of incarceration, with an observation that the appeal would be taken up for final hearing. The appeal is still pending and it appears that it may take some time for the appeal to be taken up for final hearing. In view of the prolonged incarceration, the learned Advocate for the applicant urges that the present application be allowed.

4. The learned APP has taken us through the relevant evidence on record and submits that the dead body was recovered pursuant to the disclosure statement made by the applicant. He further

submits that there is evidence to indicate that there was a quarrel between the applicant and the deceased. According to the learned APP, this is not a fit case for grant of relief to the applicant.

5. We have considered the submissions advanced by both sides. Admittedly, the case is based on circumstantial evidence. Since the applicant has been behind bars for a period of little over ten years and there is every possibility that the appeal may not be taken up for hearing in the near future, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we are inclined to allow the application. Hence, the following order :

#### ORDER

(a) The substantive sentence imposed on the applicant by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangli in Sessions Case No.22 of 2014 vide judgment and order dated 19<sup>th</sup> July 2017 shall remain suspended till the final disposal of Criminal Appeal No.785 of 2017.

(b) The applicant be released on furnishing a P.R bond in the sum of

Rs.15,000/- (Rs. Fifteen Thousand only).

6. The application stands disposed of.

[AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J.]

[ R.G. AVACHAT J.]