



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL APPLICATION [B.A.] NO. 1387 OF 2025

Archana w/o Manish Puttewar

-- VERSUS --

State of Maharashtra

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. S.P. Bhandarkar, Advocate a/w Mr. L.L. Girdhar, Advocate
for the Applicant.

Mr. A.R. Chutke, A.P.P. for the Non-applicant/State.

CORAM : M.M. NERLIKAR, J.

DATE : FEBRUARY 09, 2026.

Heard.

2. The present application is filed seeking regular bail in Crime No.312/2024 for the offence punishable under Sections 302, 279, 201, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (IPC), Sections 134 and 177 of the Motor Vehicle Act, 1988, registered with Police Station Ajni, District Nagpur.

3. The applicant has raised grounds of parity, non-supply of grounds of arrest and delay in trial in the present application. This Court, by a detailed order dated 25/08/2025, rejected the bail application of the present applicant, wherein not only merits, but also non-supply of grounds of arrest has been considered. However, the learned counsel

appearing for the applicant submits that one co-accused - Niraj has been granted bail by the trial Court. Therefore, the present applicant has applied for bail on the ground of parity, however, the trial Court has rejected the bail application, considering the fact that the role played by the present applicant is different than the role played by the said Niraj.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant as well as the learned A.P.P. Admittedly, this Court, by a detailed order dated 25/08/2025, has rejected the bail application of the applicant, wherein not only merits, but also grounds of arrest has been considered in detail. After perusal of the order, I find that, Court has considered each and every aspect of the matter. Further, the Court has considered the circumstance against the present applicant. After perusal of the order of this Court as well as the Court below, I find that the present applicant is the main conspirator and it appears that the present applicant has given the contract to kill the deceased. Therefore, role played by Niraj is different than the present applicant. Therefore, parity cannot be claimed.

5. Further, so far as “delay in trial” is concerned, nothing is placed on record by the applicant in order to show that there is delay in trial. He has invited my attention to the application which was filed, wherein a vague statement was made that

“the present applicant / accused No.3 is under the jail custody since last more than 1 year”. However, the fact remains that, the charges have now been framed. Therefore, I am of the opinion that even the ground of “delay in trial” cannot be considered, as hardly any time has lapsed. In this view of the matter, I am of the considered opinion that the present applicant has failed to demonstrate any change in circumstance, and accordingly, the application is **rejected**. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

[M.M. NERLIKAR, J]