

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL BAIL APPLICATION NO.2751 OF 2005

Shri.Pradeep @ Balu Pandurang Kamble ...Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent

.....

Mr.Manoj J.Bhatt for Applicant.

Mr.A.S.Gadkari, A.P.P. for Respondent.

.....

CORAM: A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.

APRIL 29, 2005.

P.C.

1. Heard Counsel for the parties. Perused the record.

2. There is evidence to indicate the complicity of the Applicant in the commission of the offence. Counsel for the Applicant, however, submits that the Applicant is entitled for bail on parity along with co-accused Deepak Naik and Amar Baburao Nalawade.

3. Indeed, the role of the Applicant and that of co-accused may be somewhat similar, even so, as rightly submitted by the learned A.P.P., no indulgence can be shown to the Applicant because there are antecedents against the Applicant. The Applicant has been found indulged in the present offence, while he was released on bail in relation to some other offence. There are, in all, nine cases registered against the Applicant.

4. In this view of the matter, not a case of bail. Hence, rejected.

5. As prayer for bail is rejected, Sessions Court, Pune is directed to assign the trial to the Fast Tract Court, to ensure early disposal of the trial. In case, it is not possible to allocate the matter to the Fast Tract Court, for any reason whatsoever, the Trial Court may dispose of the matter as expeditiously as possible as High Court Expedited Case.

6. Applicant shall co-operate for the early

disposal of the trial. If the Trial Court is of the opinion that the Applicant is, directly or indirectly, responsible for causing delay in disposal of the trial, that fact be recorded in the Roznama, which can be considered, as and when occasion arises.

7. Application disposed of accordingly.

A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.