



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (BA) NO. 255/2026

(Moreswar S/o Pisaram Eknath Vs. The State of Maharashtra)

AND

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (BA) NO. 256/2026

(Sawnath @ Sawan S/o Kashinath Eknath & anr. Vs. The 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. R.M. Daga, Advocate for applicants.
Mr. V.A. Thakare, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM: M. M. NERLIKAR, J.

DATED : 16/03/2026.

Heard.

2. By these applications, the applicants are seeking bail in connection with Crime No. 1019/2025 registered with Police Station Kalmeshwar, Dist. Nagpur for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 118(1), 189(2), 191(2), 191(3), 190, 238 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita along with Sections 3, 4 read with Section 25 of the Arms Act.

3. The FIR states that on 23/11/2025, during a public event at Shankarpat, a group of individuals, led by Parameshwar Eknath and others, allegedly gathered with the intent to cause harm. The informant Sanjay Rameshji Pohwa, reported that he, along with two others, were

attacked by the accused with firearms and other weapons. One person, Balya Gujar, sustained a gunshot injury to his leg, while two others, Mukesh Mahapure and Sunil Gujar, were also injured. The FIR further states that the accused allegedly acted with prior knowledge of ongoing disputes and came prepared with weapons to the event, causing serious injuries to the victims. Based on these allegations, the FIR was lodged.

4. This Court by an order dated 09/02/2026 in Criminal Application (BA) No.19/2026 has granted bail to Rohan S/o Ratan Eknath and Dinesh S/o Ishwar Soneshwar. The learned counsel for the applicants submit that all the three applicants in present two applications, are similarly situated, therefore he claimed parity. He submits that the role played by Roshan Eknath is similar to the role which is attributed to the present applicants. Therefore he submits that considering the bail granted by this Court to those two accused persons, the present applicants deserve to be enlarged on bail on the ground of parity. He also submits that applicants are not having antecedent.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP submits that the bail may not be granted as it is unlawful assembly and the role cannot be bifurcated at this stage. He submits that though the investigation is over and charge-sheet is filed, there are serious allegations against all the accused persons. The learned APP has also invited my attention to the injury certificate of three injured.

6. I have considered the rival submissions. This court has already released on bail two persons by order dated 09.02.2026. For the same reason recorded in the order dated 09.02.2026 and the fact that the present applicants are standing on the same footing as of Roshan Eknath, I am inclined to grant bail, hence the following order:-

ORDER

- (i) Criminal applications are allowed and disposed of.
- (ii) The applicant/accused namely Moreshwar S/o Pisaram Eknath, Sawanath @ Sawan S/o Kashinath Eknath and Akash S/o Pisaram Eknath be released on regular bail in connection with Crime No. 1019/2025 registered with Police Station Kalmeshwar, Dist. Nagpur for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 118(1), 189(2), 191(2), 191(3), 190, 238 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita along with Sections 3, 4 read with Section 25 of the Arms Act on their furnishing P.R. Bond of Rs. 25,000/- each with one

surety in the like amount.

(iii) The accused shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, as also shall not tamper with the evidence.

(iv) The accused shall provide their residential address and cell number to the concerned Police Station and shall not change their place of residence without prior intimation to the concerned Investigating Officer.

(v) The applicant/accused shall attend each and every date of trial regularly. If they fail to attend the trial for two consecutive dates or fails to comply with the aforesaid conditions, their default would entail the State to ask for cancellation of bail.

(M. M. NERLIKAR, J.)