

ORDER BELOW EXH.54

(State of Maharashtra Vs. Immu @ Imran & others)

1] The present application seeking bail has been filed on behalf of the accused no.4 Sunil Nettlekar. The said accused had been produced in the court on 13-10-2025 on the execution of an NBW which had been issued against him on account of his absence.

2] As per the application, the accused had gone out of town for labour work and had then forgotten the date of the matter. He had also fallen ill due to which he had remained absent. Stating that the economic position of this accused is extremely bad that he has the responsibility to look after his mentally challenged daughter as his wife has expired and he would remain present on each date once he is released, his Advocate is seeking the relief of bail.

3] The ld. APP has strongly opposed the application for bail. In his reply, he has pointed out that the matter in question is very old and has remained pending due to the absence of the accused persons. Pointing out that the reasons given in the application to explain the absence of the accused have not been supported by any documents, he has sought the rejection of the same.

4] Heard the Advocate for the accused and the ld. APP for the State. The record will show that the charge in the matter had come to be framed on 22-2-2019 against three accused persons, as one Javed Pathan had expired by then. During the pendency of this matter even the accused Rohit Bais has expired. The roznama of the matter will show that the same has remained pending due to the absence of the accused no.1 Imran Sheikh and the present accused no.4 Sunil Nettlekar. The charge against the accused persons also pertains to serious offences like section 399 r/w

section 34 of IPC and under section 4 r/w section 25 of the Indian Arms Act as also section 135 of the Maharashtra Police Act. The conduct of this accused in remaining absent once he came to be released on bail and inspite of the charge in the matter having been framed long back will clearly indicate that he cannot be relied upon to remain present once released. I therefore, do not find any substance in the application. The same therefore, stands rejected.

Date : 10.11.2025

(Ms. S.J. Ansari)
Addl. Sessions Judge, Wardha.

Certificate

“I affirm that the contents of the P.D.F. File order are same word for word as per original order.

S.V. Dakhane,
Stenographer G-1