

**Bail Application in Sessions Case No. 48/2024**  
Shrikrushna @ Litar Devidas Tale Vs. State (**Exh. 12**)  
(CNR NO. MHBU20-000724-2024)

**ORDER BELOW EXH. 12**  
**(Passed on this the 04<sup>th</sup> Day of September, 2025)**

**01]** Accused Shrikrushn @ Litar Devidas Tale filed bail application for grant of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita.

**02]** It is the case of prosecution that on 19.04.2024 at about 09.30 a.m. at Sawangi Tea point accused Devidas and his two sons were beating to the brother of informant namely Eknath. Accused Pavan and accused Shrikrushn caught hold his hand, whereas accused Sitaram gave blow of iron rod on the head of Eknath. Brother of informant - Hariram intervened to resolve the dispute and that time accused Devidas beat him by means of iron rod. Accused Shrikrushn gave blow of iron fighter on the face of Hariram. Meanwhile, informant also intervened to resolve the dispute. Accused Devidas told him to give 4 Gunthe excess land. He gave blow of the iron rod on his back and that time accused Shrikrushn caught hold his hand. Accused Pavan also beat him by means of stick. He threatened to kill him and abused in filthy language. After this incident, informant lodged report at Police Station, Sakharkherda. Injured Eknath died in Shrikrupa hospital during treatment, therefore, Section 302 of I.P.C. came to be added in crime No. 110/2024 registered at Police Station, Sakharkherda.

**03]** Learned counsel Mr. Javed Shaikh for the applicant vehemently argued that incident took place on 19.04.2024. Thereafter, report came to be lodged on 30.04.2024 at belated stage. Applicant is arrested on 07.05.2024. He further submitted that initially an offence under Section 324, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code came to be registered against accused person. Later-on offence under Section 302 of I.P.C. was added on 08.05.2024. Pointing out allegation in the report and first information report, learned counsel submitted that applicant never intended to kill any person. He did not cause single injury to deceased Eknath. The prosecution has not satisfactorily explained 12 days delay in lodging report, which indicates that report was lodged after thought. He further submitted that considering role of the applicant, only offence under Section 324 of I.P.C. would be attracted. Therefore, he prayed to release the applicant on grant bail.

**04]** Per contra learned A.P.P. Mr. A. A. Kesale for the State strongly opposed bail application relying on the say of Investigating Officer. He submitted that informant and injured were admitted in the hospital and therefore, delay caused in lodging report. He further submitted that delay is satisfactorily explained. He further submitted that applicant has taken active participation in the commission of murder of Eknath. Prima-facie case is made out against accused person. He further submitted that if the applicant is released on bail, he may tamper to prosecution witnesses. Therefore, learned A.P.P. prayed to reject the bail application.

05] Having considered rival submission of either side and going through case papers it appears that previous anticipatory bail application and regular bail application of the applicant were rejected. Pursuant to report, FIR, statement of witnesses it explicit that applicant has actively participated along-with other accused person in the commission of murder of Eknath. The applicant caught hold the hands of deceased and thereby helped accused Devidas to commit an offence of murder. Applicant has used iron fighter in this offence, which is dangerous weapon by which death is likely to be caused. Report, F.I.R. further discloses reasons of delay, which is supported by medical certificate etc.

06] It is undisputed fact that applicant and injured, witnesses are neighbours and relatives of each other. If the applicant is released on bail, he may tamper to prosecution's evidence or he may flee from justice. Therefore, considering nature and gravity of the offence, punishment prescribed thereof and role of applicant, application is liable to be rejected. With this, I proceed to pass following order.

**- O R D E R -**

Bail Application (Exh. 12) is rejected.

(Dictated and pronounced in open court).

Place: Mehkar  
Date : 04.09.2025

**(Sagar K. Mungilwar)**  
**Additional Sessions Judge**  
**Mehkar, Dist. Buldhana**

:: 4 ::

Sessions Case No. 48 / 2024  
State Vs. Devidas Sitaram Tale and other

**CERTIFICATE**

I affirm that the contents of this PDF file Order / Judgment are correct word to word as per the original.

Name of Court : Shri. Sagar K. Mungilwar  
Additional Sessions Judge, Mehkar,  
Dist. Buldhana.

Name of Steno : Shaikh Imran Abdul Rauf,  
Stenographer, Grade-1, Mehkar.

Date : 04.09.2025