

Shubhada S Kadam

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 310 OF 2026

Jagdish Chintaman Patil

....Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

....Respondent

Mr. A. P. Mundargi, Senior Advocate along with Ms. Pravada Raut,
Advocate for Applicant.

Mr. Prashant P. Jadhav, APP for Respondent-State.

Mr. Himanshu Gavit, Advocate for Intervenor (Through VC.)

CORAM : SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.

DATE : 25th FEBRUARY, 2026.

P.C. :

1. By this application, the applicant is seeking regular bail in Crime No. 444 of 2025 registered with Panchavati Police Station, District Nashik, for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 55 and 3(5), Section 3(25) of the Arms Act and Section 135 of the Maharashtra Police Act.

2. It is prosecution's case that on 17th September 2025, around 1.05 am, the co-accused fired at the injured- Sagar Jadhav, with an intention to kill him and seriously injured him. It is alleged that the applicant was one of the conspirators of the said attack.

3. It is contention of learned senior counsel for the applicant that no evidence is produced on record to show the role of the applicant in the

Shubhada S Kadam

said crime. The statement of eye-witness Karan Barve, who was the waiter in the hotel where the convict was brought by the police, is recorded. In the said statement, he has not mentioned the name of the applicant, that he met the convict - Shekhar Nikam. The applicant is behind bars for more than four months. It may take time to conclude the trial. Hence, requested to allow the application.

4. It is contention of learned APP along with learned counsel for intervenor that the attack on the injured was done on the say of the applicant and co-accused. In the statement of eye-witness Karan Barve, he has stated that when the convict Shekhar Nikam came to the hotel, the applicant was present there. There is CCTV footage showing the presence of the applicant in the hotel; it shows that the applicant had conspired with the co-accused to eliminate the injured on the ground of an old dispute. If the applicant is released on bail, he may threaten the prosecution witnesses. Hence, it is requested to reject the application.

5. I have heard all learned counsel, perused charge-sheet and documents produced on record. The allegations against the applicant are of conspiracy. The alleged incident occurred on 17th September 2025, whereas the meeting with the convict was held on 9th September 2025. The incident occurred after seven days of the said meeting. To prove the role of the applicant in the crime, evidence is required. The applicant is

Shubhada S Kadam

behind bars for more than four months. It may take time to conclude the trial. Considering these facts, I pass following order :

ORDER

- (i) The applicant be enlarged on bail in Crime No. 444 of 2025 registered with Panchavati Police Station, District Nashik, on executing P.R.Bond in the sum of Rs.30,000/- with one or two sureties in the like amount.
- (ii) The applicant shall attend the Panchavati Police Station, once in a month, on every first Monday of the month, between 11.00 am to 1.00 pm till conclusion of the trial.
- (iii) The applicant shall not tamper with the evidence or attempt to influence or contact the complainant, witnesses or any person concerned with the case.

The application is allowed in the aforesaid terms and is accordingly disposed of.

6. It is made clear that the above observations are made only for the purpose of granting bail and the Trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits in accordance with law and uninfluenced by the observations made in this order.

7. All concerned to act on the authenticated copy of this order.

(SHIVKUMAR DIGE, J.)