



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1641 OF 2026

Rahul Teja Indrajeet Singh ...Applicant
Versus
The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

Mr. A.R. Bukhari for the Applicant.

Mr.S.S. Ghag, APP for the Respondent-State.

Mr. Vinod Chavan, API, Nizampura Police Station District Thane

CORAM: R. M. JOSHI, J.

DATED: 15th APRIL, 2026

PC:-

1. Applicant seeks bail in connection with CR. No. 23 of 2018 registered with Nizampura Police Station, Dist. Thane for the offences punishable under Sections 457, 380, 460, 302, 201 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code. (for short "I.P.C.).

2. In brief, it is the case of the prosecution that on 29.01.2018 at about 9:30 a.m., first informant, Manager of Oshaka Textile Bhiwandi was informed over phone call by one



of the workman i.e Gurudev Pandey have been murdered and his dead body was found in the factory premises. When he reached to the spot of incident, he found that deceased had sustain injuries on his head and other parts of the body. On the basis of said report offence came to be registered against unknown person. During the course of the investigation, involvement of the applicant and co-accused was revealed in this crime and hence, they came to be arrested. The applicant is arrested on 01.02.2018 since then he is in jail. The chargesheet has been filed. The charges have been framed, however, the prosecution evidence has not yet commenced.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that for over a period of 8 years applicant is in jail without trial. According to him, co-accused against whom an exactly similar role has been attributed, has been granted bail by this Court by order dated 12.12.2025 in Bail Application bearing No. 4631 of 2025, therefore, he seeks bail on parity.

4. Learned APP, opposed the application, he drew attention of this Court of the observation made by this Court in order



dated 12.12.2025 indicating that the applicant no.1 has caused actual assault on the deceased. It is his submission that there is recovery of blood stained clothes of the accused so also the stolen articles connected him with the crime in question.

5. A specific query was made to the learned APP as to show whether there is any evidence to indicate that the applicant is assailant and not the co-accused. From the material in the chargesheet nothing is seen in order to attribute the assault only against the present applicant. On the contrary the evidence so collected indicates that there is exactly similar recovery from the co-accused, who is on bail. Thus, the role attributed to both accused persons cannot be distinguished from the facts appearing from record.

6. Applicant has no criminal history. The trial has not commenced till date. In all 32 witnesses are to be examined and hence, there is no possibility of completion of trial in reasonable time. Hence by applying parity applicant deserves bail.



7. Hence, following Order:

ORDER

- i) The applicant be enlarged on bail, on executing PR Bond in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- with one or two local sureties in the like amount;
- ii) The applicant shall attend the Trial Court concerned on each and every date unless exempted by the orders of the Trial Court concerned;
- iii) The applicant shall also attend the police Station concerned one in month between 11:00 am to 02:00p.m.
- iv) If the applicant has not deposited his passport, if any, the applicant shall deposit the same with the Police Station concerned;
- v) The applicant shall not leave the State of Maharashtra, without permission of the Trial Court;
- vi) The applicant shall not leave India, without permission of the Trial Court;



vii) The applicant shall not tamper or attempt to influence or contact the complainant, witnesses or any person concerned with the case;

viii) The applicant shall inform his latest place of residence and contact number immediately after being released and / or change of residence or mobile details, if any, from time to time to the Court seized of the matter and to the Investigating Officer of the Police Station concerned.

8. Application is allowed in the above terms and is accordingly disposed of.

9. It is made clear that the observations made herein are prima facie and are confined to this application and the learned Trial Judge to decide the case on its own merits, uninfluenced by the observations made herein.

(R. M. JOSHI, J.)