

Shephali

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 166 OF 2026
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3710 OF 2025
IN
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 166 OF 2026

Suresh Parmeshwar Bhilare ...Appellant
Versus
The State of Maharashtra & Anr ...Respondents

Mr Satyavrat Joshi with Samay Pawar, for the Appellant.
Mr HJ Dedhia, APP, for Respondent No. 1-State.
Ms Davindar Kaur Sabharwal, for Respondent No. 2.

CORAM: R. M. JOSHI, J.

DATED: 18TH FEBRUARY 2026

PC:-

1. This Appeal is against the rejection of bail in connection with Crime No. 473 of 2024 registered with Sinhgad Road Police Station, Pune.

2. Learned counsel for the Appellant submits that the investigation into the crime is already over and charge-sheet has been filed. It is his submission that the trial is not likely to be concluded in short period and in view of the fact that the Appellant was arrested on 26th August 2024, this is a fit case of his enlargement on bail. He drew attention of the court to the First Information Report, so also, statements which according to him

SHEPHALI
SANJAY
MORMARE

Digitally signed by
SHEPHALI SANJAY
MORMARE
Date: 2026.02.24
09:36:50 +0530

indicate that there were quarrels between the deceased and the Appellant and considering the reason for the quarrel, it cannot be said that the accused/Appellant had any motive to kill the deceased. On these other amongst submissions, he seeks bail.

3. Learned APP and counsel for Respondent No. 2 opposed the Appeal. They drew attention of the Court to the statement of witnesses as well as PM notes which indicate that the Appellant had intention to kill the deceased.

4. Prima facie perusal of the record, evidence and statements of witnesses obtained during the course of investigation indicate that the Appellant came to the spot of the incident with knife. Apart from the fact that he carried the knife, when he caused one blow on the deceased ran away from spot, he, however, followed him and thereafter inflicted other blows. The perusal of the PM notes indicate that there were as many as 18 injuries on the person of the deceased, out of which, there were three stab injuries and one puncture injury. This evidence *prima facie* clearly supports the case of the prosecution that Appellant had intended to kill the deceased.

5. Having regard to the seriousness of the crime, the Trial Court was justified in rejection of bail.

6. Hence, Appeal stands dismissed.

7. Pending Interim Application, if any, shall stand disposed of.

8. It is clarified that the observations made hereinabove are on prima facie consideration of the material record and the same shall not bind the Trial Court during the final hearing of the Appeal.

(R. M. JOSHI, J.)