

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 130 OF 2026

Sohel Salim Ankalgi

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

...

Mr. Umesh H. Pawar, Advocate for Applicant.

Mr. Nitin B. Patil, APP for the Respondents-State.

...

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 27th APRIL, 2026

P. C. :

1. The applicants seek regular bail in connection with C.R. No. 281 of 2020 dated 04.09.2020 registered with Sangli City Police Station, District Sangli, for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 143, 148, 149 of the *Indian Penal Code*, Sections 4 and 25 of the Arms Act, Sections 37(1) & 37(3) of the Maharashtra Police Act, 1951 and Sections 3(1)(ii), 3(2), 3(4) of the Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act, 1999.

2. Learned Counsel for the applicants submits that the applicant/accused No.3 is falsely implicated in the crime. The co-accused are released on bail by this Court vide order dated 10.10.2022 in Bail

Application No.3816 of 2021 and in Bail Application No.4447 of 2021 by order dated 10.11.2022. Considering the number of witnesses, the trial is likely to take a considerable time. As such, further detention of the applicants would be unjustified.

3. Per contra, learned APP opposed the application submitting that the offence is serious in nature. The role of the applicant is distinct from that of the co-accused, who are released on bail. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

4. Having heard the submissions from both the sides and upon perusal of the record including charge-sheet indicates that the role of the applicant is more or less similar to that of the co-accused released on bail by this Court. Therefore, the applicant is also entitled for parity. Moreover, considering the nature and manner of allegations, prima facie there is a possibility of over implication.

5. While the prosecution highlights the applicants' criminal antecedents, it is a settled principle of law in the case of ***Prabhakar Tewari Vs. State of U.P. and another [(2020) 11 SCC 648]*** that mere existence of prior cases does not serve as a ground to deny bail, if the facts of the current case, fail to establish a prima facie necessity for continued incarceration.

6. Given the age of applicant and the prolonged incarceration coupled with the fact that the trial is still in the initial stages, the further detention of the applicant may amount to pre-trial detention which is neither justified nor warranted. Therefore, I am persuaded to exercise discretion in favour of the Applicant.

7. Hence, the order :-

ORDER

I. Criminal Bail Application is Allowed.

II. Applicant - Sohel Salim Ankalgi be released on bail, on furnishing P.R. bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rs.Fifty Thousand) with one or two local solvent sureties, in the like amount, in connection with C.R. No. 281 of 2020 dated 04.09.2020 registered with Sangli City Police Station, District Sangli, for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 143, 148, 149 of the *Indian Penal Code*, Sections 4 and 25 of the Arms Act, Sections 37(1) & 37(3) of the Maharashtra Police Act, 1951 and Sections 3(1)(ii), 3(2), 3(4) of the Maharashtra Control of Organised Crime Act, 1999, on the following conditions :-

(a) The applicant shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses and tamper with the prosecution evidence, in

any manner.

(b) The applicant shall attend the trial on each and every date unless exempted by the trial Court.

(c) The applicant shall submit Aadhar and Pan Cards to the Investigating Officer and detailed address and phone numbers and two of the near relatives.

(d) In case of breach of any of the conditions by the applicant, it is open for the Prosecution to approach the concerned Court seeking cancellation of bail, notwithstanding the fact that this Court has granted bail.

III. Needless to state that the observations rendered herein are to the extent of this application and the trial Court shall not be influenced by the same.

[SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.]