

Shivgan

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 2392 OF 2025

Ramesh Phoolchand Prajapati	...Applicant
<i>Versus</i>	
State of Maharashtra	...Respondents

Mr. Atul Prakash Kakade, with Deepali R. Saudagar, for the Applicant.

Ms. Veera Shinde, APP for the Respondent-State.

Mr. Kshirsagar, PSI attached to Ghatkopar Police Station, present.

CORAM: R. M. JOSHI, J.
DATED: 23rd APRIL, 2026.

PC:-

1. The Applicant claims himself to be in love relationship with the Victim. However, the allegation against him is that, he assaulted her with a knife in her own house. The offence came to be registered vide C. R. No. 74 of 2022, dated 25th February 2022 registered with Ghatkopar Police Station, Mumbai for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 309, 342, 452, 506(2) and Sections 37(1)(a) and 135 of the Maharashtra Police Act. The Applicant seeks bail in connection with the same.

2. In short, it is the case of the prosecution that the Applicant and the Victim were said to have an affair. The parents of the Victim refused to marry her to the Applicant. On the fateful day, the Applicant came to the house of the Victim. He disclosed his intention to marry the Victim to her mother. When she refused the

said proposal, he took out a knife, which was brought by him with him and caused assault on the Victim. The record further indicates that the Applicant was found in the house in an injured condition. He is said to have slit his wrist. On conclusion of investigation, charge-sheet is filed.

3. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits that this is a case of love affair between the Applicant and the Victim. He attempted to draw attention of the Court to the discrepancies, which according to him, have found in the investigation. In this regard, reference is made to the spot panchanama, which according to him, shows that the room in which the incident has occurred, was bolted from outside whereas, there is a statement of eye witness indicating that the said room was bolted from inside. He claims that there is no explanation with regard to the injuries caused to the accused. It is his further submission that the Victim has already been examined and as such, no prejudice will be caused to the prosecution, if the Applicant is released on bail.

4. The learned APP opposes the Bail Application by submitting that evidence in this case, has already commenced. It is pointed out that the Victim is examined before the Trial Court. According to her, twelve more witnesses are to be examined and as such, the trial would get over within six months.

5. Having regard to the nature of allegations against the present Applicant and particularly, in view of the fact that the trial would get over within six months from today, this Court finds it appropriate to direct the Trial Court to complete the trial within six months from today.

6. The Bail Application is disposed of in the above terms.
7. In case, the trial is not concluded within six months from today, it is open for the Applicant to revive his prayer for bail.

(R. M. JOSHI, J.)

SHAMBHAVI
NILESH
SHIVGAN
Digitally
signed by
SHAMBHAVI
NILESH
SHIVGAN
Date:
2026.04.23
18:50:19
+05'30