

MHAU160008932025



Sessions Case No.145/2025
(Old Sessions Case No.50/2024)

Shravan Suresh Pimpale

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra

ORDER BELOW BAIL APPLICATION EXH.5

Accused – **Shravan Suresh Pimpale** has filed this application for grant of **bail** under Section **483** of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita.

[2] Brief facts of the prosecution case are as under :-

Informant – Arjun Kale is running shop in the front portion of his house. Therefore, rolling shutter is there on the front side of his house. Sajjan Pimpale son of aunt of the informant is residing in his neighbourhood. About 4 to 5 years above Deepali, cousin sister of the informant eloped with accused – Shrawan Pimpale and the family of the informant was against them. Accused – Shrawan was knowing this fact. Therefore, he had grudge in his mind against the informant and his family.

[3] On 25.07.2023 at about 11:30 p.m. the accused along with one unknown boy came there on the motorcycle and parked it at some distance from the house of the informant. At that time, the informant along with his brother, sister, said Ajay Pimpale were

standing in front of their house. Suddenly, the accused appeared there and started to load bullet in his revolver. The informant saw the accused coming towards him and immediately shut down the shutter. However, the accused fired on round towards the shutter, due to which the bullet passed throughout the shutter and hit on the knee of the informant, due to which jean pan wearing by the informant got torn and the informant sustained injury on his knee. Then, the accused abuses to the informant and by threatening him to kill left the spot.

[4] Then, police were called on the spot. Police took the informant to Ghati Hospital, Aurangabad. On 26.07.2023 at about 04:15 a.m. the informant lodged FIR against the accused. Accordingly, crime vide 632/2023 came to be registered. On 16.11.2023 the accused was arrested. Then, the investigation was completed and charge-sheet was filed. Now, the accused is in judicial custody, therefore, he has filed this application for grant of bail.

[5] On perusal of the material placed on the record, it appears that during the investigation the accused was forwarded to Police Custody remand for three days. However, the pistole used in the crime could not be seized from the accused. Investigating Officer prepared panchanama of the spot. At that time, it was found that there was a hole by bullet to the iron shutter of the shop of the informant. One bullet and empty cartridge of the bullet were found on the spot. Therefore, only because pistole was not recovered, it

cannot be inferred that the accused did not fire on the informant. Statements of eye-witnesses and medical evidence available on the record supports the prosecution case. So also, as per the say of the I.O. the accused is habitual offender. As many as eight criminal cases of serious nature are pending against him. Therefore, considering the prima facie reliable evidence on the record, I am of the opinion that there are reasons to believe that the accused has committed the offence as alleged by the prosecution. In the circumstance, if the accused is released on bail possibility of his absconding and tampering with the prosecution evidence cannot be ruled.

[6] Having regard to the above mentioned facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the opinion that the accused is **not** entitled for grant of **bail**. In the result, the application deserves to be rejected. I, therefore, pass the following order. :-

ORDER

Application (Exh.5) is rejected.

(S.B. Bahalkar)

Additional Sessions Judge,
Gangapur.

Date : 17.11.2025

Dist: Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar