

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
BAIL APPLICATION NO.2583 OF 2025**

Manoj Ramesh Shinde

...Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Anr.

...Respondents

Mr. Nilesh Navale, *for the Applicant.*

Mr. S.S. Ghag, *APP for the Respondent - State.*

Mr. Yash Aggwal i/by Shubham Chaoudhar, *for the
Respondent No.2.*

PSI – Sunil A. Pawar, Murbad Police Station, present.

CORAM R. M. JOSHI, J.

DATED: 11TH MARCH 2026

PC:-

1. By this Application, the Applicant seeks his enlargement on bail in connection with C. R. No.42 of 2024, registered with the Murbad Police Station, for the offences punishable under Sections 305 and 363 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, Sections 8, 10 and 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 and Section 75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.

2. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits that the out of six accused persons, the juvenile as well as two other co-accused have been enlarged on bail. It is his submission that the role alleged against the present Applicant is of a lesser degree than that of those who are granted bail. In this regard, reference is made to the order of this Court dated 26th June, 2025, passed in Bail Application No.4771 of 2024. He further submits that even the statements of the witnesses accepted to be correct, there is nothing on record to indicate that the present Applicant caused any assault on the deceased, which led him to commit suicide. He contends that the Applicant has been in custody since 24th February, 2024, and the trial is not likely to conclude within a short period of time.

3. Learned APP and learned counsel for the Respondent No.2 oppose the bail application. In order to oppose the application they drew attention of the Court to the statements of Mayur, Gaurav and a minor girl. By relying upon their statements, it is contended that there is evidence to

show involvement of the present Applicant in this crime. Reference is also to the suicide note found in the mobile phone of the deceased.

4. There cannot be any dispute made with regard to the fact that *prima facie* perusal of the record does not indicate any actual assault being caused by the present Applicant on the deceased. No doubt, reference has made by the witnesses to the present Applicant with regard to he going to the house of the deceased and making enquiries with him regarding the recording of the video of the incident. Even if these statements are accepted to be true, they do not indicate actual assault being caused by the Applicant on the deceased. In such circumstances, when the Applicant has no criminal history behind him and as the trial is not likely to be completed within a reasonable period of time, this is a fit case for applying principle of parity. It is pertinent to note that the orders passed by this Court granting bail to the co-accused

have not been challenged before the Supreme Court. Hence,
the following order:-

ORDER

- a) The Application is allowed.
- b) The Applicant is directed to be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) with one or more solvent sureties in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, subject to the following conditions:-
 - i) The Applicant shall not tamper with the evidence or attempt to influence any witness.
 - ii) The Applicant shall report to the Investigating Officer on first Monday of every month between 10.00 a.m. and 12.00 noon for a period of three months.

iii) The Applicant shall appear before the Trial Court on every date of hearing, unless prevented by sufficient cause.

iv) The Applicant shall not leave the territorial jurisdiction of the Trial Court without prior permission.

v) The Applicant shall not indulge in any criminal activity during the pendency of the trial.

vi) Breach of any of the above conditions shall entail cancellation of bail.

5. It is made clear that the observations made herein are *prima facie* and are confined to this Application and the learned Trial Judge to decide the case on its own merits, uninfluenced by the observations made herein.

(R. M. JOSHI, J)