

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl) No(s).24/2014

(From the judgement and order dated 23/12/2013 in CRLA No.2255/2013, of  
The HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT AURANGABAD)

DEEPAK Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ANR. Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for stay and office report)

Date: 19/02/2014 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE B.S. CHAUHAN  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.Y. EQBAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. SIKRI

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Nishant Ramakantrao Katneshwarkar, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Ms. Asha G. Nair, Adv.  
Mr. Abhishek Kumar Pandey, Adv.

Mr. Aniruddha P. Mayee, Adv.  
Mr. Charudatta Mahindrakar, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

Leave granted.

The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order.

| (DEEPAK MANSUKHANI) | (SAROJ SAINI) |  
| Court Master | Court Master |

(Signed order is placed on the file)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO(s). 467 OF 2014  
(Arising out of SLP(Crl.) No(s). 24 of 2014)

DEEPAK Appellant(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ANR. Respondent(s)

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Leave granted.

The appellant is entitled for the benefit of regular bail for the reason that once the regular bail has been granted, the order of grant of anticipatory bail even otherwise becomes meaningless. Therefore, in such facts and circumstances, there was no question of cancelling the anticipatory bail.

In view of the above, the appellant is entitled to the benefit of regular bail. The conditions imposed for the regular bail on the appellant will continue.

The appeal is allowed accordingly.

.....J.  
(Dr. B.S. CHAUHAN)

.....J.  
(M.Y. EQBAL)

.....J.  
(A.K. SIKRI)

NEW DELHI  
FEBRUARY 19, 2014.

